

rights are trampled on in utter disregard of announced Government policies? Is it any wonder that there are protests and criticism against continuing the OPA when the men who administer the law disregard their own announced policies? At best, price control is an emergency measure in a democracy like the United States. Men who are given the responsibility of applying emergency measures should have judgment enough to be democratic enough to be ever mindful of the rights of the small businessman. In this case they have not only ignored the small businessman; they have gone further. When the proof they themselves required has been submitted, their answer is an admission that losses have occurred but better times are around the corner this season.

If the Louisiana processors are to be relieved of this financial loss it must be done now. It seems to me that the Department of Agriculture, in anticipation of an increased price of sugar, and knowing that the Louisiana processors cannot benefit from this increase, because when the increase is allowed their sugar would have been marketed, should authorize an additional subsidy of 25 cents per hundred pounds of raw sugar, with a recapture clause to protect the subsidy paid in the event the price of sugar should increase during the life of this proposed additional subsidy.

I wonder if the Members of the House recall the speech made by former Secretary of Agriculture Henry Wallace many years ago in Louisiana, when he said in effect that the Louisiana sugar industry was inefficient and should be liquidated. Certainly the great record Louisiana's sugar industry made during the war should dispute this statement—but I sometimes wonder whether or not the Henry Wallace philosophy and plans are not now being put into effect by the actions of the OPA and the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion—at any event, they are securing the results which he contemplated.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HORAN, for 3 weeks, on account of official business.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4350. An act to amend section 3646 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the issuance of checks in replacement of lost, stolen, destroyed, mutilated, or defaced checks of the United States, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1308. An act to amend article 6 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy; and

S. 1364. An act to provide for the compromise and settlement by the Secretary of the Navy of certain claims for damages to property under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, to provide for the execution of releases by the Secretary of the Navy upon

payment of such claims, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, November 30, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10:30 a. m. on Friday, November 30, 1945, in room 1304, New House Office Building, to consider H. R. 4719.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

The Committee on the Census will hold a hearing at 10 o'clock a. m. on Thursday, December 6, 1945, on H. R. 4781, in room 1414, New House Office Building.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XXII reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4381. A bill for the relief of Frantisek Jiri Bovelek or Georg Bovelek; with amendment (Rept. No. 1319). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 4857. A bill to expedite the admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DE LACY:

H. R. 4858. A bill to amend the National Housing Act so as to stimulate private home building in the low-priced field and facilitate home ownership for low-income groups, by providing for mortgage insurance on rental housing which the tenant has an option to purchase without making lump-sum down payment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. Res. 431. A resolution with respect to foreign policy of the United States as it relates to the Republic of Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JONES:

H. Res. 432. A resolution creating a select committee to make a full and complete investigation and study of the Department of State; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. Res. 433. A resolution to provide for a study and investigation of all phases of the foreign policy of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 434. A resolution to provide for payment of expenses of the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 433; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. Res. 435. A resolution to provide for the appointment of fact-finding bodies in connection with industrial disputes; to the Committee on Labor.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN of New York:

H. R. 4859. A bill for the relief of Angelica Balabanoff; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 4860. A bill for the relief of Materials Handling Machinery Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 4861. A bill granting a pension to James Thomas Lanpher; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RIZLEY:

H. R. 4862. A bill for the relief of Walter R. Newcomb, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 4863. A bill to establish the date of acceptance of a commission as lieutenant (junior grade), United States Naval Reserve, by William Leon de Carbonel to be June 1, 1941, and the date of reporting for active duty to be December 9, 1941, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4864. A bill for the relief of Willie Crockett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELSAESSER:

H. R. 4865. A bill granting an increase of pension to Frank A. Klein; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 4866. A bill for the relief of Ezra Butler Eddy, Jr., and wife, Marie Claire Lord Eddy; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in a world filled with sights that sadden and problems that perplex, may our hearts be strengthened by the realization that ours is also a time of splendor, bright with promise as we stand at the portals of tomorrow. May the crashing of outworn things that are falling to earth not hide from our eyes the glory of a new era struggling to birth.

We give thanks with humble yet kindling hearts that we are summoned to live and give in such a time. If this weary flesh of ours hemmed by foes should fear or falter, keep us firm and steadfast as we put on the whole armor of faith and hope and love. May we play our part as Thy faithful servants in history's crowning hour. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, November 29, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the

Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 1064) to authorize the discharge of midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy because of unsatisfactory conduct or aptitude, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. VINSON, Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, and Mr. COLE of New York were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 4350) to amend section 3646 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the issuance of checks in replacement of lost, stolen, destroyed, mutilated, or defaced checks of the United States, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on November 29, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1208. An act to amend article 6 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy; and S. 1364. An act to provide for the compromise and settlement by the Secretary of the Navy of certain claims for damage to property under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, to provide for the execution of releases by the Secretary of the Navy upon payment of such claims, and for other purposes.

#### SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports (list No. 1) reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 6 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by his immediate predecessor; (list No. 2) the cases of 1,257 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service; and (list No. 3) the cases of 190 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by him, under the authority vested in the Attorney General by the said statute, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is necessary for me to be absent from the Senate either a part or all of this afternoon, and I ask unanimous consent at this time to be excused.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Nebraska is excused.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Gurney	Reed
Ball	Hart	Revercomb
Barkley	Hayden	Robertson
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Russell
Brewster	Hill	Saltonstall
Briggs	Hoey	Shipstead
Brooks	Huffman	Smith
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Stanfill
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Butler	Kilgore	Taft
Byrd	Lucas	Taylor
Capehart	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Carville	McKellar	Tobey
Chavez	McMahon	Tunnell
Connally	Magnuson	Tydings
Donnell	Maybank	Vandenberg
Downey	Mead	Wagner
Eastland	Millikin	Walsh
Ellender	Mitchell	Wheeler
Ferguson	Moore	Wherry
Fulbright	Morse	Wiley
George	Murdoch	Willis
Gerry	O'Daniel	Wilson
Gossett	O'Mahoney	Youn
Green	Overton	
Guffey	Radcliffe	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent on official business as heretofore stated.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is necessarily absent. He has been excused.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

#### AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE TO FILE A REPORT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, assuming that the Senate will recess over until Monday when it completes its business today, I ask unanimous consent that a report may be filed from the Committee on Commerce during the recess of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. WALSH:

A resolution adopted by local union No. 227, Textile Workers Union of America (CIO), Lawrence, Mass., favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 1349) to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution adopted by the Emmet Associates of The Clan-na-Gael, Lynn, Mass., relating to the Ireland Partition Act passed by the British Parliament in 1920; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Newport, Mass., protesting against the enactment of legislation to merge the Army and Navy Departments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Middlesex County Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Newton Centre, Mass., requesting that the ruling by the War Department that American soldiers captured and made prisoners of war while in action are not entitled to battle participation stars, be changed so that they may be accorded the same honors as their comrades in arms; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the War Service Committee, Massachusetts Dental Society, Worcester, Mass., favoring the release of more dentists from the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Massachusetts Association of Real Estate Boards, Boston, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation to delay the construction of new public and institutional buildings until homes are made available for the returning members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

#### UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING—PETITIONS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the RECORD a petition signed by 5 North Dakota residents in favor of universal conscription. Also a petition signed by 27 North Dakota citizens who are opposed to universal military conscription. The petition was circulated by Mr. Gust Swanke, who has three sons at the present time in the service. Also a petition signed by 35 citizens of North Dakota in opposition to universal military training. The petition was circulated by Mr. Frank Witty, whose daughter has just been discharged from the WAVES. Also a petition signed by 31 North Dakota citizens from the vicinity of Drayton, N. Dak. Another petition circulated by Mrs. Emma Poline, signed by 16 citizens of North Dakota, all opposed to universal military training. Another petition signed by 22 North Dakota citizens. Still another petition signed by 12 North Dakota citizens all opposed to universal military training. Another petition signed by 25 citizens of North Dakota, the petition having been circulated by Leo E. Walz, of Zap, N. Dak. Another petition in opposition to universal military training signed by eight residents of Solen, N. Dak. Another petition signed by 29 citizens of North Dakota in opposition to universal military training, circulated by Mr. T. A. Bangen, of Sanish, N. Dak. Another petition signed by 19 citizens of North Dakota, circulated by Mrs. Walter Bohlen, of Braddock, N. Dak. Another peti-



tion circulated by Mr. Ursus Hoffmann, of Zap, N. Dak., signed by 14 citizens of North Dakota, in opposition to universal military training.

There being no objection, the petitions were received and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

One petition received as follows:

*"To the Senate of the United States:*

"We, the undersigned, hereby favor universal peacetime military conscription as expressed in President Truman's recommendation to Congress."

One petition received as follows:

*"To the Senate of the United States:*

"We, the undersigned, are hereby opposed to universal peacetime military conscription as expressed in President Truman's recommendation to Congress."

One petition and letter as follows:

*"To the Senate of the United States:*

"We, the undersigned, hereby favor universal peacetime military conscription as expressed in President Truman's recommendation to Congress."

"Hon. WILLIAM LANGER:

"I received your petitions and went into town to see what the opinion was in the community and here are the results. I presented both petitions to everyone that signed and here are the results.

"I have 3 boys in the Army, one has been in for 9 years, and has enlisted again for 3 years more, O. K. he is a master sergeant now and he likes Army life so they made a soldier of him, but I think you can't make a soldier of anyone that doesn't want Army life.

"So I am against conscription, if you have it, you can't call this a free country any more and my boys fought to have this free country, so let us keep it that way.

"Yours truly,

"GUST SWANKE."

Ten petitions received as follows:

*"To the Senate of the United States:*

"We, the undersigned, are hereby opposed to universal peacetime military conscription as expressed in President Truman's recommendation to Congress."

#### EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR INVESTIGATION OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 194, merely providing for a continuation of an investigation of the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Post Office Department, which was authorized by Senate Resolution 35, adopted by the Senate on February 26, 1945, the original resolution (S. Res. 35) having been offered by the two Senators from Florida [Mr. PEPPER and Mr. ANDREWS]. This resolution (S. Res. 194) asks for no additional appropriation. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the authority conferred by the Senate Resolution 35, Seventy-ninth Congress, agreed to February 26, 1945, as extended by Senate Resolution 112, Seventy-ninth

Congress, agreed to May 8, 1945 (relating to an investigation of the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Post Office Department), is hereby continued during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

#### INVESTIGATION OF MEANS OF INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN TRANSPORTATION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I ask unanimous consent to report favorably with an amendment, Senate Resolution 161, reported by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] from the Committee on Interstate Commerce on July 28, 1945. The resolution provides for an investigation of all means of interstate and foreign transportation. I do not think there will be any objection to its consideration.

Mr. TAFT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, may the resolution be read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of all means of interstate and foreign transportation including transportation by means of aircraft, railroads, inland waterways, busses and trucks, and pipe lines with a view to determining (1) the interrelation of these agencies of transport; (2) the postwar character and adequacy of the services furnished in interstate and foreign commerce by these agencies of transport; (3) the developments and improvements that may be expected in foreign and interstate commerce; (4) such legislation to be recommended as will result in a consistent public policy fair to all competing agencies of transportation, to the using and investing public, and to labor; and generally to consider and to make recommendations to the Congress to the end that the Nation's commerce will be transported with the greatest possible degree of economy, safety, and dispatch.

Sec. 2. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures within the limits of S. Res. 9, Seventy-ninth Congress, agreed to January 6, 1945, as it deems advisable.

Sec. 3. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and to expend not more than \$5,000 from the contingent fund of the Senate in such investigation.

Sec. 4. The committee shall, from time to time, in its discretion, make such report or reports to the Senate as it deems desirable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I notice that the resolution proposes an investigation by the Interstate Commerce Committee of all forms of transportation, including aircraft. I have no personal

feeling on the subject, but I did not know whether members of the Commerce Committee were advised regarding the matter, and whether it should be taken up in the absence of the chairman of that committee.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to have an opportunity to examine the resolution. I ask that it go to the calendar, or its consideration be deferred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine object to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I wish the Senator from Maine would not object. The resolution merely provides for an investigation and study to be made of the whole problem. It is a subject of very much interest to the committee and to everyone engaged in the transportation industry. A study has been made by a special committee appointed by the President some time ago. The proposal contained in the resolution is that a study be made to see what should be done generally with the whole transportation system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is objection to the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to speak to what the Senator from Montana just said. I certainly am in general sympathy with the idea of an integrated study. There are, as the Senator from Montana and other Senators know, certain jurisdictional questions concerning which there has been considerable discussion with respect to aircraft and other matters. I should like an opportunity at least to look at the resolution and have an opportunity for the chairman of the Commerce Committee to consider it, although I am not prepared to indicate that I shall have any serious objection.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that objection has been made to the resolution, and therefore it goes to the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It automatically goes to the calendar.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

A bill and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 1636. A bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to designate the Department of State as the disposal agency for surplus property outside the continental United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating the first Sunday in December of each year as Disabled American Veterans Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to issue annually a proclamation designating December 15 as Bill of Rights Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

# ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION — AMENDMENT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to be proposed by me to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 266) making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. I ask that the amendment be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

The amendment submitted by Mr. WHERRY is as follows:

On page 3, strike out lines 1 to 6, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) That such country shall supply to accredited United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration personnel all necessary facilities, credentials, documents, and safe conduct in carrying out the objectives of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration agreement and in making all necessary inspections and investigations, including inspections and investigations by personnel other than nationals of such country for the purpose of obtaining information as to the need for and the use of the relief and aid being or to be furnished such country."

## APPOINTMENT OF AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES IN UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILLIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

## MAYFLOWER COMPACT DAY ADDRESS BY MAURICE H. THATCHER

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address on the Mayflower Compact, delivered by Hon. Maurice H. Thatcher, governor of the Society of Mayflower Descendants in the District of Columbia, on November 22, 1945; which appears in the Appendix.]

## AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY AFFECTING CHINA

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, for some time those who have observed the antics of our Department of State have been disturbed seriously as to just what our officials have in mind. On the one hand, they have been working for a strong United Nations Organization; yet, on the other hand, they have been in favor of keeping strong American forces in China, and have agitated for universal, compulsory military training at home.

These policies are contradictory of each other. If the State Department believes that we can unite with other nations to prevent war, then why is it necessary to conscript millions of American boys each year and to keep tens of thousands stationed in China?

In reference to our men in China, I should like to pose a few questions to the Senate and to the administration:

Why are our men being kept in China, long after the Japs have been crushed, and, apparently, the war they went out to fight has ended?

Are not the oft-maligned Russians withdrawing their troops according to their treaty with the Chinese Nationalist Government?

Why are goods and materials of war being flown by American pilots over the "hump" to supply the Nationalist Government, and why are American lives being sacrificed in this endeavor, according to newspaper accounts?

What possible stake has the average American in the outcome of China's civil war?

Who are we to use force for one side or another in a controversy 8,000 miles from our continental limits to resolve an internal quarrel of another nation, in the face of our oft-repeated statements that this Nation has no interest in the internal problems of other nations?

Mr. President, like all other Senators, I am receiving many letters from distressed mothers and fathers who have sons in China and in the Far East who want to know why their sons are being kept there. These parents cannot understand—as you and I cannot understand—our devious diplomacy in the Far East, but they do know that they want their sons back home and out of the armed services. If the security of the United States is involved in this outcome of civil war in China, the matter should be laid before the Congress, and authority should be sought for whatever action is decided to be necessary.

The statements of Maj. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, our late Ambassador to China, certainly do nothing to dispel our doubts about the efficiency of our foreign service. Many intelligent persons are wondering if the Department of State is not trying to use the Army both in Europe and in Asia to cover up its own serious blunders.

Let me quote a portion of General Hurley's statement:

The hydra-headed direction and confusion of our foreign policy in Washington during the late war is chargeable to the weakness of our foreign service. If our foreign service had been capable of understanding and a sympathetic effectuation of our announced war aims, it would not have failed so completely to couple our logistical strength with our foreign policy to obtain commitments to the principles for which we claimed to be fighting from the nations to which we gave the strength of our productivity and manpower.

It seems to me that our Department of State has a lot of explaining—and housecleaning—to do in the coming months.

The questions which I have raised here are referred to the congressional committees which have announced their intention of investigating this situation. I am hopeful that our position in China will be fully clarified when the President makes his announced statement on the subject.

Mr. President, I have not noticed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement which was made by General Hurley, and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the Record at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of November 28, 1945]

I am grateful to both the President and the Secretary of State for the support they have given me and for their kind offer in requesting me to return to China as Ambassador.

In one capacity or another, I have been on the perimeter of America's influence since the beginning of the war.

During the war I have served in Java, Australia, New Zealand, and generally in the Southwest Pacific, in Egypt, Palestine, the Lebanon, Syria, Trans-Jordan, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Russia, Afghanistan, India, Ceylon, Burma, and China.

Of all of the assignments, China was the most intricate and the most difficult. It is a source of gratification to me that in all my missions I had the support of President Roosevelt, Secretary Hull, Secretary Stettinius, President Truman, and Secretary Byrnes.

### ASTONISHING DISCREPANCY SEEN

In the higher echelon of our policy-making officials American objectives were nearly always clearly defined. The astonishing feature of our foreign policy is the wide discrepancy between our announced policies and our conduct of international relations. For instance, we began the war with the principles of the Atlantic Charter and democracy as our goal.

Our associates in the war at that time gave eloquent lip service to the principles of democracy. We finished the war in the Far East furnishing lend-lease supplies and using all our reputation to undermine democracy and bolster imperialism and communism.

Inasmuch as I am in agreement with the President and the Secretary of State on our foreign policy, I think I owe it to them as well as to the country, to point out the reasons for the failure of the American foreign policy in reaching the objectives for which we said we were fighting the war.

I will confine my remarks in this statement to Asia, although I wish to assure both the President and the Secretary of State that I shall be at their service in discussing frankly other phases of our international relations.

I was assigned to China at a time when statesmen were openly predicting the collapse of the National Government of the Republic of China and the disintegration of the Chinese Army.

### DIRECTED TO KEEP CHINA IN WAR

I was directed by President Roosevelt to prevent the collapse of the Government and to keep the Chinese Army in the war. From both a strategical and diplomatic viewpoint, the foregoing constituted our chief objective. The next in importance was the directive to harmonize the relations between the Chinese and American military establishments and between the American Embassy in Chungking and the Chinese Government.

It will readily appear that the former objective could not be accomplished without the accomplishment of the secondary objective as a condition precedent. Both of these objectives were accomplished. While these objectives had the support of the President and the Secretary of State, it is no secret that the American policy in China did not have the support of all the career men in the State Department.

The professional foreign-service men sided with the Chinese Communist armed party and the imperialist bloc of nations whose policy it was to keep China divided against herself. Our professional diplomats continuously advised the Communists that my efforts in preventing the collapse of the National Government did not represent the policy of the United States. These same pro-



professionals openly advised the Communist armed party to decline unification of the Chinese Communist Army with the National Army unless the Chinese Communists were given control.

Despite these handicaps, we did make progress toward unification of the armed forces of China. We did prevent civil war between the rival factions, at least until after I had left China. We did bring the leaders of the rival parties together for peaceful discussions. Throughout this period the chief opposition to the accomplishment of our mission came from the American career diplomats in the Embassy at Chungking and in the Chinese and Far Eastern Divisions of the State Department.

#### "CAREER MEN" HELD "RELIEVED UP"

I requested the relief of the career men who were opposing the American policy in the Chinese theater of war. These professional diplomats were returned to Washington and placed in the Chinese and Far Eastern Divisions of the State Department as my supervisors. Some of these same career men whom I relieved have been assigned as advisers to the supreme commander in Asia.

In such positions most of them have continued to side with the Communist armed party and at times with the Imperialist bloc against American policy. This is an outline of one of the reasons why American foreign policy announced by the highest authority is rendered ineffective by another section of diplomatic officials.

The weakness of American foreign policy has backed us into two world wars. We had no part in shaping the conditions that brought about these two wars. There is a third world war in the making. In diplomacy today we are permitting ourselves to be sucked into a power bloc on the side of colonial imperialism against Communist imperialism.

I am opposed to both. I still favor democracy and free enterprise.

Our announced policy in the First World War was to make the world safe for democracy. That slogan was elaborated for the Second World War by a definite statement of principles in the Atlantic Charter and the Iran Declaration.

#### FAILED TO ESTABLISH PRINCIPLES

We won both wars, but in both instances we failed to establish the principles for which we alleged we were fighting. America's foreign policy officials have always been divided against themselves. Consequently, we have always been a prey to the nations that give lip service to our ideals and principles in order to obtain our material support. The war that is now in the making is not even intended to defend or establish democratic ideals. Instead of putting our weight behind the Charter of the United Nations, we have been definitely supporting the Imperialist bloc. At the same time a considerable section of our State Department is endeavoring to support communism generally, as well as specifically, in China.

The hydra-headed direction and confusion of our foreign policy in Washington during the late war is chargeable to the weakness of our Foreign Service. If our Foreign Service had been capable of understanding and a sympathetic effectuation of our announced war aims, it would not have failed so completely to couple our logistical strength with our foreign policy to obtain commitments to the principles for which we claimed to be fighting from the nations to which we gave the strength of our productivity and manpower.

A democracy must live on its intelligence and its integrity and its courage. To the people of the democracy should be given all the facts to enable them to form correct opinions. The discrepancy between American foreign policy as announced in the At-

lantic Charter and the Iran Declaration and in the President's recent Navy Day address, and as carried into effect, may be attributed in large measure to the secrecy which has shrouded the actions of the State Department. All too frequently information concerning its conduct leaks out to the public in distorted, garbled, or partial form. The result is that the American people have too little basic information to judge the extent to which their State Department correctly interprets and administers the foreign policies of the Nation.

During the war we had to maintain secrecy to prevent giving aid to the enemy. I grant that sometimes during the war we had to be expedient. Now we should endeavor to be right. I raise this issue because I am firmly convinced that at this particular juncture in our history an informed public opinion would do much to give intelligent direction and implementation to our international objectives.

#### CALLS FOR FULL PUBLICITY

With special reference to China and the other nations where I have served in the last 4 years, the blessings of factual publicity would be manifold. Now that the war is over, I am willing that all my reports be made public, together with the reports made by those officials in the foreign service who have differed with the promulgated American policy.

Our true position in China is misunderstood abroad because of this confusion of policy within our own Government. This situation suggests the need for a complete reorganization of our policy-making machinery, beginning at the lower official levels. No international policy can succeed without loyal and intelligent implementation.

Because of the confusion in our own international policy, America has been excluded economically from every part of the world controlled by colonial imperialism and Communist imperialism. America's economic strength has been used all over the world to defeat American policies and interests. This is chargeable to a weak American foreign service.

I wish to absolve from this general indictment some of our career men. Some of them are very admirable and well-equipped public servants who have fought in the State Department and in other countries against overwhelming odds to advance American ideals and interests.

America's economic and diplomatic policies should be coordinated. America's strength should not be allied with any predatory ideology.

America should support the amendment or revision of the San Francisco United Nations Charter to make it democratic.

Our strength should be used to uphold the decisions of the United Nations rather than to support conflicting ideologies or war-making power blocs.

#### PROGRESS OF ENLISTMENTS IN THE ARMY

Mr. DONNELL obtained the floor.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I feel that the Members of the Senate would be interested today in hearing a report upon the progress of enlistments in the Army. As is well known, the Congress in September passed the voluntary-enlistment bill. I have received a report from the War Department of the progress of enlistments, and I give the figures to the Senate. In September there were 12,000 enlistments. In October there were 65,000 enlistments in the Army. From

November 1 to November 14 enlistments in the Army alone numbered 81,094. In other words, the average daily enlistments in the Army at this time exceed 5,700 a day. With that average, Mr. President, we know that volunteers are now entering the Army at a rate of 175,000 a month.

I wish further to say to the Senate that there are now pending in committee two joint resolutions. One is Senate Joint Resolution 116, which calls for the immediate stopping of the induction of men with a child or children, and also creating that as a ground for release immediately from the armed services. Up to this time neither the Army nor the Navy has recognized that status as a ground for discharge. That joint resolution is the first order of business on the calendar of the Military Affairs Committee when it meets next Tuesday.

There is another joint resolution pending before the Senate Military Affairs Committee, Senate Joint Resolution 117, which calls for the immediate suspension of the draft. I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that at the time of the fall of Japan, when actual fighting ended, the President of the United States said that 50,000 inductees each month under Selective Service were sufficient to fill the needs of replacements in the armed services without interfering with the return home of servicemen who had had war service. So, based upon the formula set forth by the President of the need for only 50,000 men a month, we now know that with volunteering proceeding at the rate of more than 175,000 a month, we can put an end to the draft and suspend its operation of induction without interfering in any way with the return home of the men who have seen service. The return of war-service veterans and their discharge is still the first consideration from my viewpoint, and it should be the first consideration of the armed services and of the Government to see that those men are returned home as promptly as can be. From the reports I am receiving, particularly from the Pacific area, that is not being carried out as rapidly as should be done.

I call these figures to the attention of the Senate so that it may be known that the voluntary enlistment law is a success, and that men are volunteering for service.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me to ask a question of the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia if the conclusion from what has happened is that with safety without affecting the return of soldiers from abroad, further drafting under the Selective Service Act, could now be ended?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Undoubtedly so, because if replacements of 50,000 a month are sufficient, and if only 51,000 a month have been taken for both the Army and the Navy, then I say that enlistments of 175,000 a month would certainly justify ending the draft. It is

just a matter of figures and clear logic that the draft can be ended at this time without interference with the return home of the men who have had war service.

Mr. TAFT. I would only say that it seems to me we could do nothing more important than to prevent the taking of boys from their homes, if it is not necessary to do so, and in my judgment there can be nothing more important for the Military Affairs Committee or for the Senate to consider than the termination of the Selective Service Act at this time so far as drafting is concerned.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Ohio that I am glad to have his comment on that subject, but there is going on today under selective service, something even worse than the taking of young men in this country. The Army today is drafting into the service men who have children and families to support and is sending some of those men broad as replacements.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. I do not know whether the Senator was a Member of the Senate at the time when Congress lowered the draft age to 18 years.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I was not a Member of the Senate at that time.

Mr. WILLIS. The argument for that proposal was that younger men were needed in the critical emergency which was facing the country. Now that the emergency has passed should not the younger men be released from service so that they may pursue their courses of education and make plans for their life work?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I will say to the Senator that the first consideration is the return home of men who have seen service on foreign shores. That is still the first question which should be considered. And, secondly, the return home of men who have dependents, who should be returned to their families and again take up their normal lives toward the support of those to whom they owe that duty. I think that when these men are no longer needed for enforced service, when we are receiving volunteers to send to serve in the armed forces, the time has come under our American idea of living to stop impressed service.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Did I understand the Senator from West Virginia to say that the figures reported by him did not include any reenlistments in the Navy?

Mr. REVERCOMB. The figures I have given are for the Army alone. I have asked to be furnished the figures for the Navy today, but they have not come to me as yet.

Mr. GEORGE. Is there a separate enlistment for the Navy now in progress?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; there is a separate enlistment. I will say to the Senator that in the middle of the month of October enlistments in the Navy were proceeding at the rate of 500 a day. I have not the figures as of the present

date, but I have asked for them and expect to receive those figures later today.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me see if I understand the Senator's statement. Up until the 15th of November, 81,000 men had been enlisted from November 1 to November 15.

Mr. REVERCOMB. From November 1 to November 15, 81,094 had enlisted.

Mr. GEORGE. In the Army alone.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In the Army alone; and prior to that time, in the month of October, 65,000 enlisted. In September 12,000 enlisted. The Senator will remember that the bill was passed in the month of September. In all, 158,094 have enlisted in the Army.

Mr. GEORGE. I hope the Senator will press his resolution before the Military Affairs Committee. I do not believe that we have any moral right to keep the men who have been drafted into the Army for more than 6 months after the end of the war—and I believe that means the actual end of hostilities—unless the discharge of the men brought in under the draft would disorganize the Army.

The Senator is quite right in his statement that immediately after the surrender of Japan, the President published a statement to the country to the effect that it would be necessary to have for the military forces only about 50,000 men a month. If the Army alone is receiving more than that number each half-month, we ought to provide for the discharge of the men who were brought into the Army under the draft to fight the war into which we were plunged on December 7, 1941.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very grateful for the remarks of the able Senator from Georgia. He has expressed my view exactly on this subject. I will say to him that not only are men coming in at a greater rate than 50,000 a month, the figure stated by the President as the number needed for replacements, but, as shown by the figures given by me today and furnished by the War Department, they are volunteering at a rate of more than three times the number stated to be required by the President. I feel that the time has come when we may justly end the draft without interfering with the return home of those who ought to be returned promptly.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I believe that when those boys are returned we might also return labor borrowed from Mexico, Jamaica, and other countries. I believe it is necessary at the present time to keep these young men in the United States to help produce the things which we need—clothing, machinery, and products of all kinds. By drafting experienced help we are retarding the day of recovery.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am glad to have the remarks of the Senator.

#### APPOINTMENT OF AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES IN UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies

of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such Organization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, beginning with line 8, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 11 and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 6. The President is authorized to negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to enter into such agreement or agreements, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur, providing for the numbers and.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on that question.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. AIKEN and Mr. ANDREWS.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I desire to be heard further on this matter.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I raise the point of order that the roll call has started.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that there has been no response.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, may I speak?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, what was the ruling of the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ruling of the Chair was that there had been no response. Therefore the Senator from Missouri can be recognized to speak on the pending question.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understood the rule to be that when the calling of the roll began that ended the debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that that is not the case when no response has been made.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well. I subside.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Would it embarrass the Senator if I were to ask him about how much time he expects to take?

Mr. DONNELL. I expect to speak rather extendedly. It is difficult to say to the Senator how long I shall take, but I expect to speak quite extendedly on the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator speak, in general, on the same matters which he discussed yesterday, or has he some new material?

Mr. DONNELL. I shall speak generally along the lines which I discussed yesterday, but I desire to amplify that discussion to a considerable extent.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thought the Senator rather fully developed his argument yesterday.

Mr. DONNELL. I did, but I expect to discuss the question further today.

Mr. President, yesterday the Senate was engaged in debate upon an amendment which I offered with respect to section 6 of the bill now under consideration. The amendment which I propose



differs from the bill itself in a very important respect. Under the terms of the bill the agreement or agreements which the President is authorized to negotiate would be subject to the approval of both Houses of Congress by either an act or joint resolution. On the other hand, under my amendment the agreement or agreements which the President is authorized to negotiate could be entered into only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

It will be observed that the amendment proposed by me goes not to the point of imposing restrictions, but rather to the point of how there shall be registered the ratification of the supplemental agreement or agreements referred to in section 6 of the bill.

Comparatively few Senators were in the Chamber yesterday during a considerable portion of the discussion which ensued. Today I observed in the Washington Post the following comment:

Galleries, overflowing during the Charter debate 4 months ago, were only partly filled and during most of the debate fewer than a dozen Senators sat at their desks. Senators complained privately of a "lack of public interest" in the most important step by this Nation since the Charter was ratified.

Mr. President, I concur in the view of the writer of this article, Mr. Robert C. Albright, in characterizing the legislation now pending as the most important step by this Nation with relation to the Charter since the ratification of that document. I am not so sure, however, that private complaints of Senators as to a lack of public interest are as well founded as would be a complaint by Senators who were present, as well as those who were not present, at the lack of attendance by Senators themselves in the Chamber yesterday.

The public is expecting the Senate, upon which devolves important duties under the Charter of the United Nations, to devote intelligent, courageous, and diligent attention to the problems which are presented by that Charter. To my mind Members of the Senate who failed to be present yesterday and gave basis to the statement which appears in the Washington Post could now render a distinguished public service by giving further careful and intent consideration to the question of how the supplemental agreement or agreements contemplated both by article 43 of the Charter of the United Nations and by the bill now pending should be effected.

Mr. President, I invite attention to the next paragraph appearing in the Washington Post of this morning, reading as follows:

Advocates of more restrictions may register their peak load on an amendment by Senator FORREST C. DONNELL, Republican, Missouri, requiring Senate ratification of the forthcoming agreement with the Security Council on military quotas to be used to keep the peace.

Mr. President, in my opinion, if the writer of this article had in his mind the idea that the amendment which I had offered was an amendment constituting a restriction or restrictions, he did not properly comprehend the pur-

pose of the amendment. My amendment is not a restriction upon either the Security Council or the President or anyone or any nation. The amendment which I have offered and which I argued yesterday merely undertakes, as I comprehend the situation, to carry into effect the positive, direct, mandatory provisions of article 43 of the Charter of the United Nations. There is no effort or intent in this amendment to present or offer restrictions of any kind, nature, or description. But I take it that every Member of the Senate who voted upon the Charter on the 28th day of July of this year, and every Member of the Senate who was unavoidably absent on that occasion, has a right to expect that every provision of the Charter itself will be carried into effect. To my mind, section 6 of the bill which provides for approval of the agreement or agreements by joint resolution or act of the two Houses of Congress does not follow the Charter of the United Nations; specifically and explicitly, it does not follow the third section of article 43 of the Charter.

Mr. President, let me again read that section of article 43. It refers to the agreement or agreements; and that reference goes back to the earlier portions of article 43 which call to the attention of the reader the fact that the obligations or undertakings of the members of the United Nations to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security are to make available to the Security Council, on its call—not solely on its call, but also in accordance with a special agreement or agreements—armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

So, Mr. President, when article 43 refers to the agreement or agreements, both in section 2 and in section 3, the reference is to the special agreement or agreements referred to in the opening sentence and section of article 43.

Mr. President, it will be recalled that section 3 of article 43 reads as follows:

The agreement or agreements shall be negotiated as soon as possible on the initiative of the Security Council.

Then the section proceeds as follows:

They shall be concluded between the Security Council and members or between the Security Council and groups of members—

Then follows this language—

and shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

The amendment which I have submitted goes to the question of compliance with the mandatory provision of section 3 of article 43, which I have read, namely, that "the agreement or agreements shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes." Mr. President, it should be noted that the provision is not that the agreement or agreements may be subject, ought to be subject, or should be subject to ratification, but the section provides that the agreement or agreements shall be subject to ratification in the way specified.

So, Mr. President, I wish to make it perfectly clear that my amendment is not one which is in the nature of a restriction, but is designed to carry out the purpose, the intent, the express language, and, as I see it, the legal meaning of that section of article 43 of the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. President, as I indicated yesterday, my amendment has a two-fold basis. In the first place, the agreements which are mentioned in section 6 of the bill now pending are those which article 43 of the Charter requires to be negotiated. So when we come to the question of the negotiation and the question of the ratification of these agreements, we are to look to the terms of article 43 of the Charter of the United Nations in order to ascertain what are the requirements of that article with respect to how the ratification itself shall be effected. The Charter is clear, explicit, and definite, as I see it, in prescribing how ratification is to be achieved.

Mr. President, article 43, to my mind, reads clearly and convincingly to the effect which I indicated yesterday. In that article the language of the mandatory provisions respecting ratification of the agreements is susceptible of no ambiguity, as I see it, but is clear, definitive and decisive as to the meaning of the framers of the Charter and as to the meaning of the Senate of the United States when it ratified the Charter on the 28th of July 1945.

What does section 3 of article 43 comprehend and require? I have already referred to the fact that it specifies that the various agreements shall be concluded between the Security Council and also that they "shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes." So the question arises, What is meant by "ratification in accordance with their respective constitutional processes," as to the United States of America? One will search in vain the Constitution of the United States, from its opening word to its closing word, to find any constitutional process made up of approval by either joint resolution or act of the Congress. The term "ratification," it will be recalled, is the commonly used and legally used term which describes the processes for advice and consent to the making of a treaty. Yesterday I referred to numerous authorities among law writers. At this time I wish to refer to another authority. I now refer, not alone to Corpus Juris, not alone to American jurisprudence, not alone to Charles Henry Butler, not alone to James Bryce in his American Commonwealth, not alone to Mr. Curtis in his Constitutional History of the United States, not alone to Bouvier's law dictionary which indicates in clear and unmistakable language that the term "ratification," as used in the United States, refers to the process by which treaties receive the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States; but, in addition to those particular authorities, I refer particularly to the fact that the highest judicial authority of the United States Government, the Supreme Court of the United

States, in the case entitled "*Fourteen Diamond Rings v. United States*" (183 U. S. 176), at page 179, specifically states what is meant by the process of ratification.

In a concurring opinion by Mr. Justice Brown in support of the position taken by the court—the opinion, by the way, was delivered by Chief Justice Fuller—there is a reference by Mr. Justice Brown to the power of the Senate being limited to ratification. I invite attention to the word "ratification" as applied to such terms as have already been agreed upon between the President in acting for the United States, and the commissioners of the other contracting power. A sentence from Mr. Justice Brown's concurring opinion is significant in its repeated use of either the verb or the noun in reference to the word "ratification." He said:

The Senate has no right—

To what?—

to ratify the treaty and introduce new terms into it which shall be obligatory upon the other power, although it may refuse its ratification or make such ratification conditional upon the adoption of amendments to the treaty.

And so, Mr. President, obviously the Supreme Court of the United States, and the law writers to whom I have referred, understand that by the processes used by the Senate in advising and consenting to a treaty there is meant identically that which you and I, sir, term "ratification." A few moments ago I said, in substance, that the only constitutional processes of the United States of America governing ratification are those processes which relate to the ratification of treaties.

(At this point Mr. DONNELL yielded to Mr. MORSE, who briefly addressed the Senate. His remarks appear at the conclusion of Mr. DONNELL's speech, where, by request of Mr. MORSE, they were ordered to be printed.)

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, it is a very fundamental principle of the constitutional Government of the United States that the Federal Government itself possesses only such powers as are either expressly or by necessary implication conferred upon it by the Constitution of the United States. It is equally true, Mr. President, that when we come to the specific branches of the Government of the United States, namely, the legislative branch, the judicial branch, and the executive branch, each branch must look to the Constitution of the United States and to nowhere else for the authority which it possesses. No branch of the Government has any power which has not been granted to it by the Constitution.

From the earliest days of the history of our Government, when Washington, in his Farewell Address, urged constant adherence to the separation of powers, and pointed out the evil which would result from one branch of the Government undertaking to usurp the powers of another, it has been settled in this country that no branch of the Federal Government possesses any power which cannot be found either expressly or by necessary implica-

tion within the four corners of the Constitution of the United States.

Today we have before us a provision of the United Nations Charter making it mandatory that these agreements shall be subject to ratification in accordance with what? In accordance with the respective constitutional processes of the respective signatories. So, in order to ascertain what are the respective constitutional processes we must search the Constitution. In the bill before the Senate as it now stands we find that its framers, the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, have answered the question as to what are the constitutional processes of the Government of the United States, by taking the view that the constitutional process surrounding the approval of an agreement resides in the two Houses of Congress through an appropriate bill or joint resolution.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to express my agreement with the views of the Senator. If we propose in effect to delegate to the House of Representatives one-half of our right to approve treaties, in this respect, it seems to me that we will be bound, for all practical purposes of which I can think, in connection with any further supplemental agreement involving the United Nations Charter. Almost all future international agreements may be in connection with the United Nations Charter, and may require ratification by a majority vote of both Houses. In other words, it seems to me that the Senate of the United States, practically all of its members being absent throughout the entire debate on this bill, is now proposing to surrender its power, which was given to it by the Constitution, to deal with questions of foreign relations. Unless the Senator's amendment is adopted we are, for all practical purposes, surrendering that power which has been given to us under the Constitution.

I may say that the bill contains other provisions by which the Senate, in the absence of nearly all Members of the Senate, is proposing to delegate powers given to the Senate under the Constitution. Under section 3 of the bill, it is proposed to delegate to the President all power to vote in the Security Council or to veto action which may be taken by the Security Council. It is proposed to surrender any power Congress has with regard, therefore, to the use of armed forces because the President may vote for the use of armed forces. For practical purposes, it is proposed to surrender, it seems to me, the power that Congress ought to have to declare war, because, in my judgment, certainly we are giving the President the power to declare war. Certain of his actions may involve the use of police power, but other acts he is authorized to take under the provisions of section 3 may well result in war. So we are proposing to delegate to the President the power to declare war.

Again, under section 5, we are giving the President probably wider power over the economic life and foreign trade of the United States than any President has had since the Embargo Act; in fact, I

think broader powers, because, referring to section 5, the Senator will find that the President may make orders, rules, and regulations as he desires, providing for the investigation, regulation, or prohibition, in whole or in part, of "economic relations or rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication."

That means he may, by Executive order, go into any home in the United States and investigate business affairs and all correspondence and all relations that any person in the United States may have with any citizen of the Nation against whom economic sanctions are invoked. He may prohibit them, and he may put people in jail on the basis of the violation of his economic orders or his rules and regulations. I think that goes much further even than the Embargo Act in the early days of the Nation, and it is an indefinite power, for, so far as I can see, it goes on forever.

I propose to offer an amendment providing that after 90 days his order shall be only for the emergency, and that all power thereafter shall be vested in the Congress, and the Congress may, therefore, make the laws and determine whether they shall be fair or whether they shall be arbitrary.

Incidentally, it is also true that executive regulations are made with less consideration for the citizen and with less consideration for due process of law than in the case of a statute enacted by the Congress.

So in those important respects all the power over foreign relations which, in effect, we are not delegating to the President we are now proposing under the theory that we can have Executive agreements approved by the Congress, to delegate to the House of Representatives. And this entire self-abnegation of the Senate, this surrender of constitutional powers and duties given to the Senate is being made by the Senate, as I say, with practically no Members present to consider the constitutional questions involved, or the facts on the basis of which the Senate is asked practically to reduce itself to insignificance in foreign relations.

Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield for that purpose?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Chavez	Hart
Ball	Connally	Hayden
Barkley	Donnell	Hickenlooper
Bilbo	Downey	Hill
Brewster	Eastland	Hoey
Briggs	Ellender	Huffman
Brooks	Ferguson	Johnson, Colo.
Buck	Fulbright	Johnston, S. C.
Bushfield	George	Kilgore
Butler	Gerry	Lucas
Byrd	Gossett	McCarran
Capehart	Green	McClellan
Capper	Guffey	McKellar
Carville	Gurney	McMahon



Magnuson	Reed	Thomas, Utah
Maybank	Revercomb	Tobey
Mead	Robertson	Tunnell
Millikin	Russell	Tydings
Mitchell	Saltonstall	Vandenberg
Moore	Shipstead	Wagner
Morse	Smith	Walsh
Murdock	Stanfill	Wheeler
O'Daniel	Stewart	Wiley
O'Mahoney	Taft	Willis
Overton	Taylor	Willson
Radcliffe	Thomas, Okla.	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a few moments ago the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio was commenting along the line that not only in the case of section 6 of the pending bill is there an abdication by the Senate of certain of its duties and responsibilities, but that elsewhere in the bill similar tendencies exist and that dangerous precedents will be established by the abdication in the instant case.

I call attention, Mr. President, to the fact that in two other instances which have already been called to the attention of the Senate in the course of its consideration of this bill, is there, in my judgment, a similar dangerous tendency. I refer in the first place to section 2, paragraph (d), in which it is provided that:

The President may also appoint from time to time such other persons as he may deem necessary to represent the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations at such salaries, not to exceed \$12,000 each per annum, as he shall determine: *Provided*—

Mr. President, here is the portion of the section to which I call special attention—

*Provided*, That the advice and consent of the Senate shall be required for the appointment of any person to represent the United States in the Economic and Social Council or in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations if—

And I call attention to this significant "if"—

if the person so appointed is not at the time of such appointment a Member of the Senate or House of Representatives of the United States or an officer of the United States who shall have been appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The persons who are referred to in the opening of paragraph (d) under the category of "such other persons as he"—the President—"may deem necessary to represent the United States" are the persons other than those who attend the General Assembly and the Security Council. But the other persons who are referred to in paragraph (d) are by no means persons of inferior or unimportant capacities. I refer particularly in the first instance to the members of the Economic and Social Council. The Economic and Social Council is referred to in article 62 of the Charter of the United Nations in this language, which indicates the importance of membership on the Economic and Social Council:

The Economic and Social Council may make or initiate studies and reports with respect to international economic, social, cultural, educational, health, and related matters and may make recommendations with respect to any such matters to the General

Assembly, to the members of the United Nations, and to the specialized agencies concerned.

Mr. President, I digress to emphasize the importance of international economic questions and of international social questions, cultural, educational, health, and related matters. All matters such as we have considered in connection with the Bretton Woods agreements would come under the category—or would have had they not been already settled—of international economic matters. And who is there to say that an economic situation which requires an investment of \$8,000,000,000, as I recall the figure, is not an economic substantial matter of tremendous importance to the United States and to every person within it?

And then the international social questions. Who is there to say that the social questions between nations are not of tremendous and outstanding importance to every citizen of this and every other nation of the world? And the cultural matters, and the educational matters, and the health matters. Who is there to say that these are not matters requiring as appointees of this Government upon the Council having to do therewith of representatives of the highest type of ability, integrity, and intelligence?

But, Mr. President, the duties of the Economic and Social Council do not end with the tremendously important ones to which I have already made reference.

Paragraph 2 of article 62 of the Charter says of the Economic and Social Council:

It may make recommendations for the purpose of promoting respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all.

Mr. President, is there any more important task, any more important subject, before the world today than the matter of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all? These are among the topics which are committed by the Charter of the United Nations to the Economic and Social Council.

Then, Mr. President, the Charter goes on with respect to this Council and says:

It may prepare draft conventions for submission to the General Assembly, with respect to matters falling within its competence.

Who is there to deny the importance of a power to prepare draft conventions for submission to the General Assembly constituted of representatives of the peace-loving nations of the world with respect to any or all the matters which have been previously by article 62 committed to the Economic and Social Council?

Mr. President, the Economic and Social Council has implementation in the fourth section of article 62 of the Charter of the United Nations. That section reads:

It—

That is to say, the Economic and Social Council—

may call, in accordance with the rules prescribed by the United Nations, international

conferences on matters falling within its competence.

So I submit that when we are dealing in subdivision (d) of section 2 of the bill with the appointment of persons to represent the United States in the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations we are dealing with fundamental matters requiring the utmost care in the selection of persons who shall constitute our representatives thereon.

I pass to the other Council mentioned in subdivision (d) of section 2 of the pending bill, the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations. We all remember, from the newspaper accounts and from information which we may have otherwise obtained, the extremely important services rendered at San Francisco in the preparation of the Trusteeship Council provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. It was considered among the outstanding achievements of that great Conference at the Golden Gate.

What are the functions and powers of the Trusteeship Council? Article 87 of the Charter of the United Nations has to do with that subject. It says:

The General Assembly and, under its authority, the Trusteeship Council, in carrying out their functions, may—

(a) consider reports submitted by the administering authority;

(b) accept petitions and examine them in consultation with the administering authority;

(c) provide for periodic visits to the respective trust territories at times agreed upon with the administering authority; and

(d) take these and other actions in conformity with the terms of the trusteeship agreements.

The Trusteeship Council has to do with matters of vast importance. Who is there to deny the importance of a trusteeship, which by the very name indicates the trust which is reposed in the members of the Council which exercises such powers?

Article 88 of the Charter provides as follows:

The Trusteeship Council shall formulate a questionnaire on the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of each trust territory, and the administering authority for each trust territory within the competence of the General Assembly shall make an annual report to the General Assembly upon the basis of such questionnaire.

The two Councils to whose functions I have referred are among the outstanding organs of the United Nations Organization created by the Charter. Yet what do we find in subdivision (d) of section 2 of the bill with respect to the appointment of persons to represent the United States on those two Councils? It is recognized by the provisions of subdivision (d) that the individuals who are so appointed are officers of the United States; else there would be no requirement set forth in the bill that the advice and consent of the Senate shall be required for the appointment of such persons.

The point to which I refer in connection with the matter suggested by the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio resides in the fact that subdivision (d) makes a very notable series of exceptions with respect to the persons who shall

require the advice and consent of the Senate in order that their appointments to represent the United States on these two Councils may be made effective. What are those exceptions?

One is that if the individual is a Member of the Senate of the United States at the time of his appointment the advice and consent of the Senate shall not be required. I remember that not so long ago there sat in the rear row on this side of the aisle the distinguished former junior Senator from the State of Ohio, Mr. Burton. He was elevated to a position of trust, that of membership upon the Supreme Court of the United States. His ability and qualifications were recognized by the President of the United States, notwithstanding their difference in political views. Did the fact that that distinguished citizen was then a Member of the Senate of the United States relieve the Senate from its obligation to inquire into his qualifications and to give or to refuse to give its advice and consent to his appointment?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator from Missouri that I understand that there is quite a sentiment on his side of the aisle against voting today on any amendments. I assume that the Senator is acting in harmony with that view. I was wondering if the Senator would agree to vote on his amendment not later than 1 o'clock on Monday next, so that we might agree to take a recess at this time in order to accommodate the large group of Senators who do not wish to vote today?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Texas in making the suggestion. However, I am compelled to decline the suggestion, for three reasons:

The first is the fact that this amendment, striking as it does at the very foundation question, as I see it, of the duties and responsibilities of the United States Senate, striking, as it does, a blow against abdication by the Senate not only of its powers but of its duties and responsibilities, is of such surpassing importance that, in my judgment, it would be both unwise and improper for me to undertake to give such consent.

In the second place, Mr. President, I respectfully decline to give my consent because of the fact that I do not believe that I have the power to consent on behalf of any other Member on this side.

There is a third reason which to my mind should induce my declination to give consent. It is a very fundamental reason. As I see it, unless the Senate of the United States shall adopt cloture, as it has the power to do under its established rules, there should be unlimited debate. Every Member of the Senate on both sides of the aisle should have the right to unlimited debate on matters of public interest and importance.

I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator, but I respectfully decline to enter into the agreement.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I simply wish to put myself on record in favor of the Senator's observation that this must at all times be kept an open forum, with unlimited debate.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator from Oregon. His statement is to be expected from his very consistent attitude, which has been manifested in numerous instances in the past on the floor of the United States Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Am I to understand that the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Missouri oppose cloture, and will in the future vote against cloture?

Mr. DONNELL. No. There is no such understanding to be gained from the remarks of either the Senator from Oregon or myself. I can speak for myself, and I am sure the Senator from Oregon will amply corroborate my statement.

Mr. MORSE rose.

Mr. DONNELL. I pause for a moment and yield to the Senator from Oregon, who has risen.

Mr. MORSE. As I have stated on several previous occasions, I will always sign a cloture petition whenever I am satisfied that a filibuster is being conducted and that discussion is not on the merits of any issue. But I will not agree to limitation of debate except by way of cloture.

Mr. CONNALLY. I was about to observe that I share the Senator's views. I believe in full and ample debate on the floor of the Senate. I am merely wondering whether Senators who profess to adhere to that doctrine are ready to vote for cloture whenever it suits their purpose.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the fact is that both the Senator from Oregon and I signed a petition for cloture in this very body during the current session of the Congress of the United States.

A few moments ago I referred to the functions of these two councils and to the fact that the pending bill exempts Members of the Senate from the provision that the advice and consent of the Senate shall be required for the appointment of any person to represent the United States on either of the councils. I pointed out that in the case of the nomination of former Senator Burton of Ohio to membership on the Supreme Court, the Senate, of course, as a result of its intimate, personal knowledge of the nominee, acted quickly and promptly with respect to the confirmation of his appointment. But there was no failure on the part of the Senate to recognize its duty, as imposed on it by the Constitution, either to give or not to give its advice and consent. Yet we find that the pending bill follows the recent tendency of abdication of the power of the Senate, by providing for the exemption of appointments of Members of the Senate from the requirement that appointments to either of these two councils shall be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. President, subsection (d) of section 2 of the pending bill goes further. Not only does it exempt Members of the

Senate who at the time of appointment were in office, as to whom there possibly might be the contention that because of the Senate's knowledge of them, there should not be the same stringency of requirement as in the case of someone who was not known by the Senate, but it makes other exemptions. I digress to interpolate carefully and with the utmost fervency that even in the case of the appointment of Members of the Senate, I believe it is wise for the Senate to be vested not only with the power but the duty of either advising and consenting or refusing to advise and consent to their appointment to offices of importance, just the same as in the case of the appointment of any other person.

Mr. President, I was about to point out that subdivision (d) of section 2 of the pending bill exempts the appointments of Members of the House of Representatives of the United States to these councils from the requirement to receive the advice and consent of the Senate for the language reads that—

The President may also appoint from time to time such other persons as he may deem necessary to represent the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations \* \* \* : *Provided*, That the advice and consent of the Senate shall be required for the appointment of any person to represent the United States in the Economic and Social Council or in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations if the person so appointed is not at the time of such appointment \* \* \* a Member of the House of Representatives of the United States.

I do not know why this particular exemption as to the nominations of Members of the House of Representatives was included in the bill. I do know that the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] made a statement—I cannot quote it from memory with absolute accuracy, but I can state its general effect—that the House of Representatives would not be willing to have its Members subjected to the requirement of having their nominations receive the advice and consent of the Senate. Since when, Mr. President, have the Members of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress become superior to the general requirements of the Constitution of the United States? Since when has it happened that membership in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States should free the Members of that body from the same obligations to which every other citizen of the United States, including the Members of the Senate, are subject, namely, that they shall subject themselves to the scrutiny of the Senate if they are nominated by the President to be members of the councils whose functions I have outlined and briefly described this afternoon.

Article 2, section 2 of the Constitution, in referring to the power of the President, provides that—

He shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law.



The same section of the Constitution further provides:

But the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments.

Mr. President, who is there to say that members of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations of the earth or members of the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations are inferior officers whose nominations should not receive the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUFFMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. On that point allow me to suggest to the Senator that the delegates to these subordinate organizations would not be serving in permanent positions. Such positions will not be offices in the strict sense of the term.

Mr. DONNELL. Then, let me ask the Senator why it is that the bill requires the advice and consent of the Senate for all appointments to the two Councils, except in the case of the excepted persons. Does not that recognize that those positions are important offices?

Mr. CONNALLY. The advice and consent of the Senate is required in connection with the nomination of our representative on the Security Council, because the Security Council is a permanent, going concern. The consent of the Senate is also required in connection with the nomination of his assistant, the one who will take his place in his absence. But I suggest to the Senator that, although I personally have no objection to having the Senate confirm such nominations, nevertheless today the President sends delegates to a number of international conferences without consulting the Senate or the House of Representatives or anyone else.

For instance, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] has just returned from serving on a conference in London. The distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been a delegate to the International Labor Office. They did not give up their positions as Senators. They simply performed those additional functions.

For that matter, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the senior Senator from Texas were appointed as representatives of the United States at the United Nations Conference. Our appointments were not confirmed. No one ever suggested that they should be confirmed.

Furthermore, the consideration which caused the exception of the requirement in the case of Members of the House of Representatives or Members of the Senate was the thought that for the Senate to pass upon the nominations of Members of the House of Representatives and to reject or ratify their nominations in the case of temporary assignments would not contribute to the cordial rela-

tionship between the two Houses of Congress. As the Senator is bound to know, if he does not already know, the House of Representatives is a body coequal to the Senate, and the House of Representatives has a great deal of pride as to its functions, its privileges, and its prerogatives. The House of Representatives is jealous of any infringement upon its rights, either by the Senate or by anyone else.

Personally, I should not have any objection to having the Senate confirm the appointments of delegates to such commissions or boards, but I think that would be wholly unnecessary. Such appointments are not to be permanent positions. The persons receiving such appointments will not give up their regular employment, but they will merely serve temporarily in such positions.

For instance, in Mexico City at the Food and Agriculture Conference, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Texas attended, by designation of the President. We were not delegates, we had no voting powers; but we were consultants there.

That sort of thing happens from time to time. No one has thus far stated seriously, so far as I know, that such temporary assignments, made to carry out the President's wishes, should be subject to the requirement of confirmation by the Senate.

I say to the Senator further that in all these matters such delegates are simply the agents and representatives of the President of the United States, who, under the Constitution, is responsible for our international relations. It is to facilitate the performance of that function and to aid him in it that we propose that these appointees may serve in such capacities at any moment, at any time, whenever the President sees fit to have them do so.

I may point out that at the present time there is pending an agreement between the United States and Great Britain to appoint a commission to go to Palestine to investigate the Jewish problem in Palestine, and so forth and so on. I do not think anyone would contend that those delegates or commissioners should be forced to have their appointments or nominations confirmed by the Senate of the United States before they assume their duties.

I am not trying to argue with the Senator. I do not want to get into any controversy with him because the audience is small. [Laughter.] But I make these suggestions to him so that he can understand something of the motives of the committee in approving the proposed legislation in its present form.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator from Texas for his observations, but I do not find in the bill or in the Charter a basis for many of the observations which the Senator has made. In the first place, with all respect to the distinguished Senator, I may say that his multitudinous duties perhaps prevent him from examining with utmost care all details of legislation such as the pending bill. I find in subdivision (d) of section 2 of the bill not that the individuals selected for these positions are rep-

resentatives of the President of the United States but that they are appointed by the President—"to represent the United States."

The people of the United States, 130,000,000 of them, are the principals for whom these representatives on the two councils are to act. They are not the personal representatives, with all due deference to the distinguished Senator from Texas, merely of the President of the United States.

I invite further attention to the fact that the Senator's argument, as I understood it, is to the effect that there need not be any requirement of confirmation of appointments of members to the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations. I assert that the Senator has failed to read the bill, or has overlooked portions of it, because there is a distinct provision as follows:

That the advice and consent of the Senate shall be required for the appointment of any person to represent the United States—

Not the President—

In the Economic and Social Council or in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations.

In other words, Mr. President, this is not an instance of there being no provision in the bill requiring the advice and consent of the Senate upon appointment. What I am objecting to and pointing out as being along the line of the dangerous tendency suggested by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is that this provision, which makes it mandatory that the advice and consent of the Senate be first had in order to enable a person to represent the United States in either one of the councils to which I have referred, contains a sinister and serious exception to the rule. I shall discuss that matter a little later in greater detail.

Mr. President, the Senator from Texas has indicated that the appointments on these councils are merely temporary appointments. I assume that they are not permanent in the sense that they will last until the millennium, but I observe that the appointments of members on the Economic and Social Council are governed by subdivision 2 of article 61 of the United Nations Charter, which reads:

Subject to the provisions of paragraph 3, six members of the Economic and Social Council shall be elected each year for a term of 3 years.

So, Mr. President, it is not a mere temporary journey, such as the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] has recently taken to London, that is contemplated. It is not a journey to San Francisco to attend a conference there, even though the one which was held was of tremendous importance and short duration. The appointees on the Economic and Social Council serve for a term of 3 years. At the first election, 18 members shall be chosen; 6 of them for a term expiring at the end of 1 year and 6 others at the end of 2 years. This, of course, is obviously for the purpose of staggering the terms so that they will not all expire at one time.

Mr. President, although I have hastily examined the Charter with respect to membership on the Trusteeship Council, I do not find at the moment a definite statement with regard to the length of the term of membership on that Council. I do find, however, that the United Nations is authorized to establish under its authority an international trusteeship system for the administration and supervision of such territories as may be placed thereunder by subsequent agreements. I assume, Mr. President, that under that broad—I should say extremely broad—authority the United Nations would have the power, authority, and jurisdiction to specify any reasonable length of term of office for the members of the Trusteeship Council under the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Has the distinguished Senator found anything in the Charter which requires that the representatives on the General Assembly shall be only temporary appointees?

Mr. DONNELL. I have not found anything to that effect. I have not given that point particular attention, and I would respectfully request the Senator from Colorado to enlighten the Senate with regard to it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I say that there is nothing in the Charter on that point, and I shall argue it when we reach consideration of some amendments which I shall propose.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator from Colorado for his helpful and enlightening comment.

Mr. President, I have referred to the importance of membership on the Economic and Social Council and on the Trusteeship Council. Before passing from the subject of the Trusteeship Council I wish to comment further with reference to the basic objectives of the trusteeship system which has to do directly with the question of the importance of membership upon the Trusteeship Council. I quote from article 76 of the Charter of the United Nations:

The basic objectives of the trusteeship system, in accordance with the purposes of the United Nations laid down in article 1 of the present Charter, shall be—

And I read them deliberately—

(a) to further international peace and security;

(b) to promote the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories, and their progressive development toward self-government or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned, and as may be provided by the terms of each trusteeship agreement;

(c) to encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion, and to encourage recognition of the interdependence of the peoples of the world; and

(d) to insure equal treatment in social, economic, and commercial matters for all members of the United Nations and their nationals, and also equal treatment for the latter in the administration of justice, without prejudice to the attainment of the fore-

going objectives and subject to the provisions of article 80.

Mr. President, who is the Member of the United States Senate who would stand on this floor and undertake to depreciate the importance of membership upon the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations? What Member would liken it to some small or temporary body which meets, for example, for 3 or 4 weeks in London to consider a matter about which the meeting would have no greater authority than to make recommendations? Who is there to say that the furthering of international peace and security, which is the first basic objective of the trusteeship system, is not itself fundamentally important and deserving of the highest type of individuals to administer the attainment of such basic objective? Who is there, Mr. President, who would deny that the promotion of the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories, and their progressive development toward self-government or independence, as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples, and the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned as may be provided by the terms of each trusteeship agreement, is not an objective which is basic and fundamental, and one which entitles the people of this country—yes, and the people of the territories under the trusteeship system—to be assured of the selection of the highest possible type of individuals?

Who is there, Mr. President, who would undertake to say that the further basic objective of the trusteeship system set forth in subdivision (c) of article 76, namely, the encouragement of "respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion," and the encouragement of the "recognition of the interdependence of the people of the world," is not of such a basic nature as to entitle both the United States, for whom these men would be agents—not the President of the United States as the principal—not only to entitle the people of the United States but the people of the trusteeship territories, and all the peoples of the world, to the choice of the highest type of individuals?

Who is there who would deny that the insuring of "equal treatment in social, economic, and commercial matters for all Members of the United Nations and their nationals, and equal treatment for the latter in the administration of justice, without prejudice to the attainment of the foregoing objectives and subject to the provisions of article 80," is not a fundamental, basic objective which entitles the people of the world, as well as the people of our Nation, to the selection of individuals who shall have passed the careful scrutiny of the Senate?

Mr. President, these are some of the purposes of these councils. These are some of the tendencies which are set forth in the pending bill, namely, because of some considerations of temporary expediency, some considerations of keeping the House of Representatives

pleased with the attitude of this body, some considerations of what is deemed a practicality, certain persons, as indicated, are exempted from the obligation to submit themselves to the advice and consent of the Senate.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention to another fact in connection with subdivision (d). The duties imposed upon the Economic and Social Council and upon the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations Organization, obviously require men of experience; and when I say "men" I use the term in its generic sense. There may be women of experience likewise who would be qualified, and personally I hope that the freedom from distinction with respect to sex may receive an exemplification from time to time in the appointments upon these and other bodies and organs of the United Nations Organization.

Mr. President, I make the point, however, that although the highest skill and integrity and ability are required to carry out the functions of these two Councils, there is no guaranty whatsoever that merely because an individual is a member of the Senate or House of Representatives he or she is qualified to serve upon one of these Councils.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am dredging up what I am afraid is rather stale memory, but this whole subject of appointing members of the Congress to special missions developed in connection with President McKinley's establishment of the commission that dealt with the peace with Spain. There was much debate at the time on the propriety of putting members of a legislative body on a commission of that kind. Moreover, I think we can find a precedent showing that such names have been submitted to the Senate for confirmation.

It is only because of the outstanding distinction of the men who recently have represented us from the Senate on these conferences that many of us have been somewhat acquiescent in the practice. I think the Senator is entirely correct when he makes the point that that practice may well be subject to close scrutiny.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I greatly appreciate the comment of the Senator from Colorado. I wish to say to the Senate that I am pleased to know that the Senator from Colorado has had the courage to prepare and present to the Senate an amendment which will remove, as I understand, these exemptions from obligation on the part of individuals to submit themselves to the advice and consent of the Senate. Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator is entirely correct. I hope to discuss the subject on Monday.

I wonder if at this time the Senator will yield to me so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.



The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Gurney	Radcliffe
Ball	Hart	Reed
Barkley	Hayden	Revercomb
Billbo	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Brewster	Hill	Russell
Briggs	Hoe	Saltonstall
Brooks	Huffman	Shipstead
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Stanfil
Butler	Kilgore	Stewart
Byrd	Langer	Taft
Capehart	Lucas	Taylor
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Carville	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McKellar	Tobey
Connally	McMahon	Tunnell
Donnell	Magnuson	Tydings
Downey	Maybank	Vandenberg
Eastland	Mead	Wagner
Ellender	Millikin	Walsh
Ferguson	Mitchell	Wheeler
Fulbright	Moore	Wiley
George	Morse	Willis
Gerry	Murdoch	Wilson
Gossett	O'Daniel	Young
Green	O'Mahoney	
Guffey	Overton	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

(At this point Mr. DONNELL yielded to Mr. ROBERTSON who addressed the Senate on embarkation problems in the Atlantic and the Pacific. His remarks appear following Mr. DONNELL's speech.)

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I was referring a little while ago to the importance of the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations as to which paragraph (d) of section 2 of the pending bill makes numerous exceptions respecting the persons whose appointments are required to receive the advice and consent of the Senate.

I desire to supplement my previous observations by referring first to the fact that the Charter of the United Nations, in article 86, recognizes the fact that specific qualifications are required for membership on the Trusteeship Council, in the following language:

Each member of the Trusteeship Council shall designate one specially qualified person to represent it therein.

As we know, the membership in the Trusteeship Council consists of Members of the United Nations, and it is contemplated, as indicated by section 2 of article 86, that the members shall appoint specially qualified persons to represent them on that Council. Yet we find these exemptions applying to the general rule laid down by subdivision (d) as to the requirement for advice and consent of the Senate. The trusteeship system which is to be administered under the United Nations Charter shall apply, according to article 77 of the Charter, to territories which may be placed in the following categories by means of trusteeship agreements:

- (a) territories now held under mandate;
- (b) territories which may be detached from enemy States as a result of the Second World War; and
- (c) territories voluntarily placed under the system by States responsible for their administration.

It is further provided in subdivision 2 of article 77 that it will be a matter for subsequent agreement as to which terri-

ties in the foregoing categories will be brought under the trusteeship system, and upon what terms.

Mr. President, can it be doubted that any person representing the United States in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations, applicable, as it is, to the various categories of territories, must necessarily be a man or a woman of the highest integrity, intelligence, and special qualifications contemplated by article 86 of the Charter of the United Nations? Yet, as I have indicated, subdivision (d) of section 2 of the bill undertakes to exempt from the requirement for securing the advice and consent of the Senate, first, Members of the Senate; second, Members of the House of Representatives.

I now come to a third category which is exempted. This is a category the number of which is legion. I cannot say the number. I have no doubt that the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who has rendered such outstanding service to the Nation in connection with economy, could answer the question much more accurately than I can.

There is exempted by the provisions of subdivision (d) of section 2 every officer of the United States who shall have been appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. How many officers of the United States are there? Every postmaster who comes under the provisions under which the Senate advises and consents is an officer of the United States. I say nothing in depreciation of any postmaster in the United States, but to my mind, to say that merely because a man is a postmaster under the jurisdiction of the advice and consent section of the Constitution of the United States so far as his appointment as postmaster is concerned, he shall thereafter be exempted from the necessity of receiving the advice and consent of the Senate with respect to his appointment on the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations, or appointment on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, is absurd and clearly nonunderstandable.

(At this point Mr. DONNELL yielded to Mr. BREWSTER, who addressed the Senate on the subject of British military policy in Palestine. His remarks appear following Mr. DONNELL's speech.)

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I was referring to the fact that paragraph (d) of section 2 exempts from the provision that the advice and consent of the Senate shall be required for appointments to either the Economic and Social Council or the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations, to represent the United States, not only Members of the Senate and Members of the House of Representatives, but also officers of the United States "who shall have been appointed by and with the consent of the Senate." I pointed out that this exemption applies clearly to postmasters—I do not know how many postmasters there are; the number may run into thousands—who have been appointed with the consent of the Senate and who, under this provision of the bill, if, perchance, any of them should be appointed on these Councils, would be exempted from any obligation to have their appointments submitted

to the Senate for its advice and consent. With all due deference to the Postal Department and to the postmasters, I submit—and I do so just as seriously as I do in the case of Members of the Senate and in the case of Members of the House of Representatives—there is no assurance that merely because a man is the holder of a position as postmaster in this country, he is qualified to represent the United States on the Economic and Social Council or on the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations.

Mr. President, possibly the exemption does not even stop with civil officers. I am not certain what a court would hold as to the meaning of the word "officer." In the State in which the Senator, who is now temporarily occupying the Chair, and I reside, which we will agree is undoubtedly the best place in the United States in which to live, there is a controversy as to whether the term "officer" includes military as well as civil officers. I am not undertaking to pass upon that question today, but I do call attention to the fact that there is at least an opportunity for the contention, and possibly the successful contention, that by the exemption of "an officer of the United States who shall have been appointed by and with the consent of the Senate," the intent is to include not only civil officers but the great list of military officers who from day to day are appointed with the consent of the Senate of the United States.

So Mr. President, we have this section at which the amendment to be presented by the Senator from Colorado so aptly strikes. As I have said, the section undertakes to exempt vast numbers of civil officers, certainly, and possibly vast numbers of others who may be included under it, from the requirement of having their appointments receive the advice and consent of the Senate. But, Mr. President, the vice of the section is not simply its exemption of such numbers of persons from the requirement. The real underlying vice of the section, as I see it, is twofold: First, it amounts to a clear abdication by the Senate of the United States of a responsibility which to my mind it should carry upon its shoulders in the case of appointments to both these great councils, the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations. In the second place, this section, by exempting such great numbers of persons, makes it easily possible for individuals who have no capacity for service on these councils to be appointed without having the Senate of the United States have the power, even remotely, to object successfully as to either their appointment or their qualifications.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRIGGS in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wish to express my admiration and my appreciation of the superb argument the Senator has made relative to the advice and consent provisions of the bill.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I greatly appreciate the compliment given me by the Senator from Colorado, and it is doubly appreciated because of the knowledge of the Members of this body of his ability and integrity.

Mr. President, I have already referred to various functions of the Trusteeship Council. In addition, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that article 81 of the Charter of the United States provides as follows:

The trusteeship agreement shall in each case include the terms under which the trust territory will be administered and designate the authority which will exercise the administration of the trust territory. Such authority, hereinafter called the administering authority, may be one or more states or the Organization itself.

Then, Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that article 82 provides—

There may be designated, in any trusteeship agreement, a strategic area of areas which may include part or all of the trust territory to which the agreement applies, without prejudice to any special agreement or agreements made under article 43.

In other words, here we are to make agreements under article 43. Article 82 provides that—

There may be designated, . . . a strategic area or areas which may include part or all of the trust territory to which the agreement applies, without prejudice to any special agreement or agreements made under article 43—

I digress to emphasize the importance which, by Article 82, is attached to the special agreement or agreements made under Article 43. In a little while I shall have more to say with respect to the importance of those agreements; but obviously the Charter of the United Nations here recognizes that although the trusteeship council has the tremendous powers to which I have adverted—administering not merely matters of sordid monetary value, but matters which go to the following extent—

(a) to further international peace and security;

(b) to promote the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories, and their progressive development toward self government or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned, and as may be provided by the terms of each trusteeship agreement;

(c) to encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion, and to encourage recognition of the interdependence of the peoples of the world; and

(d) to insure equal treatment in social, economic, and commercial matters for all members of the United Nations and their nationals, and also equal treatment for the latter in the administration of justice, without prejudice to the attainment of the foregoing objectives and subject to the provisions of article 80.

Notwithstanding all those powers of such vast extent which are reposed in the trusteeship administration, and thus are reposed in the Trusteeship Council mentioned in subsection (d) of section 2 of the bill, nevertheless the Trusteeship Council has no power to question any

special agreement or agreements which shall be made under article 43.

So, Mr. President, I assert that article 82 is of outstanding significance in emphasizing the importance of the agreements which we are considering, and concerning which we are attempting to determine whether the advice and consent of the Senate, or an act or resolution of the two Houses of Congress, shall govern in determining the question of entering into such agreements.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It has undoubtedly occurred to the distinguished Senator that it is more than passing strange that many of those Members of the Senate who are most fervent in their speeches on the subject of human rights, and of equality of races seem totally indifferent in this debate to the point which the Senator has been expounding. They seem to be totally indifferent to the fact that the bill, in its present form, might permit the selection of any political stumble-bum for appointment to the council which will have crucial controls and influence over vast areas of the earth and of the freedoms of the people living there.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator from Colorado for his splendid contribution to this discussion.

Mr. President, the very mention of the words "strategic area or areas" is in itself indicative of the importance of a trusteeship administration, and of the importance of the Trusteeship Council. The word "strategic area or areas" have dire significance to every Member of the United States Senate, and indicate something of the tremendous power of a military nature—and a civil nature as well—which attaches to the administration of those territories.

Mr. President, I invite attention of the Members of the Senate to a fact which they should not overlook. Again I may say that I lament the fact that so few Members of the Senate are present. To my mind the matter which we are discussing today is a profound and important one, and deserves the presence in this Chamber of every Member of the United States Senate unless his presence is prevented by unavoidable illness, accident, or some other cause over which he has no control.

I was about to refer to article 83 of the Charter of the United Nations. In going further into the question of the importance of the Security Council, article 83 states:

All functions of the United Nations—

I am not talking about the Trusteeship Council, but the Security Council—

All functions of the United Nations relating to strategic areas, including the approval of the terms of the trusteeship agreements and of their alteration or amendment, shall be exercised by the Security Council.

Then Mr. President, it is provided in subdivision 3 of article 83:

The Security Council shall, subject to the provisions of the trusteeship agreements and without prejudice to security considerations, avail itself of the assistance of the Trusteeship Council to perform those functions of the United Nations under the trusteeship system relating to political, economic, social, and educational matters in the strategic areas.

Mr. President, is there a Member of the Senate or of the House of Representatives, and is there a member of the Post Office Department of our Nation who would undertake to say that in view of the fact that vast powers and responsibilities are vested in the members of the Trusteeship Council, appointments of members to the Council should not receive the advice and consent of the Senate merely because the person appointed happens to be a Member of the Senate, a Member of the House of Representatives, a postmaster, or a member of any of the great military bureaus and commissions of our Nation whose officers are listed in the book which I have in my hand, some of those persons being, perhaps, officers of the Army? Is there a man or a woman who would undertake to say that merely because a person holds one of the positions to which I have referred, his nomination should be exempt from the advice and consent of the Senate if appointed as a member of the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator has made it very clear that he does not disparage our postmasters, or anyone else who has been appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. A postmaster, no matter how experienced he might be, might not be qualified to sit as a member in the Economic and Social Council, or in the Trusteeship Council. And, conversely, a member of either Council might possess superb qualifications for that job and yet might make a very inefficient postmaster.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I think the observation of the Senator from Colorado is filled with wisdom, and I am very pleased that he has emphasized much better than I can the point which I am making. I have tried to make it clear that I am not disparaging postmasters. I see sitting on my left a distinguished member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. The distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate [Mr. McKELLAR] is the chairman of that committee. I undertake to say that the administration of the postal affairs of our Nation has given numerous examples of fine public service in every corner and section of our Nation. However, as the distinguished Senator from Colorado has indicated, the mere fact that a man is a postmaster in any city, town, or village, regardless of its size or its nature, is not conclusive evidence of the fact that he possesses special qualifications, as embraced in the words "specially qualified" in article 86 of the Charter, to serve on the Trusteeship Council. The mere fact that he is serving in the office to which he received his appointment with the advice and consent of the Senate, does not necessarily indicate that he possesses qualifications to serve as a member on the Trusteeship Council. Nor does the fact that we Members of the Senate are sitting in our seats as the result of having been selected by our constituents, necessarily establish, by any manner or means, that any one



of us is able to take part in the technical work which it will be necessary for members of either Council to perform.

Mr. President, I believe there are numerous Members of both the Senate and the House of Representatives, as well as postmasters, and officers of the Army and Navy, who are qualified to serve on these Councils. But just as it is necessary for a person who has been nominated to serve on the Federal bench to receive the advice and consent of the Senate before his appointment becomes effective, I undertake to say that the qualifications of each appointee, whether he be a Senator, a Representative, a postmaster, a general, a colonel, or whoever he may be, to serve as a member of these important councils, should first be established to the satisfaction of the Senate of the United States.

In referring a little further to the matter of the Trusteeship Council, article 84 of the Charter of the United Nations states in part:

It shall be the duty of the administering authority to insure that the trust territory shall play its part in the maintenance of international peace and security.

I now invite the attention of the Senate to the following very significant language bearing on the importance of the trusteeship administration and of the Trusteeship Council itself:

To this end the administering authority—

As I understand, that is the administering authority under the international trusteeship system—

may make use of volunteer forces, facilities, and assistance from the trust territory in carrying out the obligations toward the Security Council undertaken in this regard by the administering authority, as well as for local defense and the maintenance of law and order within the trust territory.

Mr. President, there sits within this body numerous Members who have served as governors of their States. I see three of them on my left. There are others who sit upon the other side of the aisle. Yesterday we saw sworn in as a Member of this body a former governor of one of the far western States. A while ago there was present the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts who has headed the Governors' Conference of the United States. I refer to the Junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. I am sure that all the Members to whom I have referred, who have been governors of their respective States, would join me in pointing out the possibilities of the commitment of error, the possibilities of the creation of strife, and the possibilities of bloodshed and loss of life as the result of improper administration of local defense. I may say, incidentally, that the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], who graces the chair at this moment, has served as an acting Governor of the State of Missouri, and I am sure he would join me in my statement. Every governor of this country will concur in the statement that the control and administration of the military affairs of a State, those affairs having to do with law, order, and local defense, if need be, carry within themselves the necessity for exercising a cool head, the necessity for deci-

siveness, and the requirement of ability and knowledge of the situation at hand. But, Mr. President, to say that any man, merely because he has received a commission of some kind as an officer of the United States, or merely because he has been elected a Member to the House of Representatives or to the United States Senate, is qualified to handle matters involved in foreign countries, under strange and diverse conditions, embracing questions of local defense and maintenance of law and order within trust territories, and is qualified to act as a member of the Economic and Social Council or the Trusteeship Council without being first passed upon and thoroughly considered by the Senate of the United States, is to my mind a doctrine of profoundly bad public policy.

Mr. President, it is almost impossible to pick up a newspaper without seeing spread across it in headlines references to difficulties taking place in one section or another of the world. A moment ago I picked up a copy of the Washington Post and observed such headlines as the following:

Chiang troops assured safe Mukden entry. Nationalists halt 90 miles from Manchurian city.

In the next column appears the following heading:

Tito proclaims new republic; King wrathful. Peter charges people never had chance to vote on monarchy.

I find in the adjoining column this heading:

Issue warning against troop movements as disorders spread.

Mr. President, the administration of the affairs of local defense and the maintenance of law and order within any one of these trust territories has within itself the germs of possible war in the world at any time. To say that any man, merely because he is a Member of the Senate, merely because he is a Member of the House, merely because he is an officer, postmaster, member of the Aviation Board, or whatever it may be listed in this book, or because he is an officer, perhaps, of the Army—I am not sure of the legal status of Army officers, as I have indicated—to say that those men should be exempt from consideration by the Senate is to my mind unwise and unsound.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will withhold the suggestion a moment, may I ask the Senator from Missouri whether, if the Senate should recess at this time, he would continue very long on Monday in concluding his speech?

Mr. DONNELL. I am not able to state how long it will require me to conclude my remarks. I feel that this subject matter is of such profound importance that it is unwise even to estimate the time that will be required for the proper presentation of the arguments. To my mind the fact that Senators are not in attendance even today, after a lengthy address yesterday upon the subject matter of the

bill and the pending amendment, is itself a strong argument why further presentation should be made on Monday. Of course, I shall endeavor to confine myself within reasonable limits, but I do not desire even inferentially to obligate myself as to the length or nonlength of time which will be required.

Mr. HILL. Am I to understand from what the distinguished Senator has said that even if he concludes today, it is his present intention to address the Senate again on Monday on this subject?

Mr. DONNELL. I am not certain as to that. I have not even estimated the length of time which will be required to complete my remarks. I cannot make a statement as to the length of time that will be required.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator desire to proceed this afternoon?

Mr. DONNELL. It will meet my entire approval for the Senate to recess at this time until Monday. In fact, I think it will be advisable to do so. I shall not urge it, and I am willing to continue speaking this afternoon.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to suggest to the distinguished Senator from Alabama that I apprehend very soon it will be impossible to get a quorum, and therefore it would be a good thing to go over until Monday.

Mr. HILL. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Missouri that if he will yield to me at this time I shall move a recess until Monday, when the Senator may have a larger audience of Senators present. I appeal to the Senator that he endeavor over the week end to make his speech as compact as possible so that we may vote as soon as we can reasonably do so on next Monday.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I greatly appreciate the courtesy of my distinguished friend from Alabama, for whom, as he knows, I have great admiration. I am perfectly willing to suspend my remarks at this time if the motion is to be made by the Senator from Alabama, with the understanding that at the opening of the Senate on Monday I shall have the floor.

Mr. HILL. I think there will be no difficulty in the Senator's getting the floor on Monday.

Mr. DONNELL. Very well.

#### NECESSITY FOR UNRRA APPROPRIATIONS

(During the delivery of Mr. DONNELL's speech.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I ask the Senator to yield for not more than 2 or 3 minutes in order that I may introduce some material into the Record upon a subject which, while it bears indirectly upon the subject matter of the discussion, I think is of great importance to the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks be printed in the Record at the close of the speech of the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post this morning entitled "Speed For UNRRA". I think it is very important that the Senate reconsider the action which it took the other day when objection was raised to immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 266, providing appropriations for UNRRA.

As we sit here today, discussing and debating the implementation of the United Nations Organization, millions of people in many parts of the world are hungry, homeless, sick and cold. I think it is impossible to build up the good will and mutual confidence among the peoples of the world which are so essential if the United Nations Organization is to function effectively in the pacific settlement of international disputes, unless this great nation of ours lives up to the high principles of humanitarianism and Christian morality upon which UNRRA relief is based.

The Christian teachings as to our moral obligations as individuals in relation to other individuals who are suffering from want are equally applicable when applied to the moral relationships which should exist between nations of peoples. Thus as a nation, aware of the great suffering so prevalent this winter among the peoples of less fortunate nations who are suffering from the devastating effects of the scourge of war we might well heed the great moral teachings inherent in the Biblical words:

For I was hungry, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in; naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me.

I am convinced that more lasting foundations for international cooperation and an effective United Nations Organization would be built if we would take time out from our debate over the language we should adopt in implementing the United Nations Organization and proceed to vote to provide, through the machinery of UNRRA, for food, clothing, shelter, and medicine to the destitute peoples of the war-torn world.

Mr. President, as I look at the many empty seats in the Senate I take note of the fact that many Senators are at lunch. It is pretty well recognized as a psychological law that it is difficult for persons who are well fed, well clothed, surrounded with the comforts of life, and who are far removed from the scenes of starvation and deprivation in other parts of the world, to appreciate fully the deplorable hardships which are being suffered by less fortunate peoples.

So, Mr. President, in addition to the editorial to which I have referred, and which I have asked to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, I would like to have the RECORD show as a matter of historical interest how well fed we in the Senate are as we delay action on the UNRRA appropriations bill—a bill which offers many of our fellowmen their only hope of living through the winter. Hence I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a copy of the luncheon menu in the Senate Restaurant for today. It

speaks more eloquently than I can of how well fed are the Members of the Senate. I trust that before the day is over Senators will take sufficient time to give unanimous consent to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 266 so as to provide immediate funds for use of UNRRA in order that we may stop the death ride of at least one of the four horsemen of the Apocalypse throughout the world—famine.

There being no objection, the editorial and the luncheon menu were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post]

#### SPEED FOR UNRRA

Every observer reporting on the economic situation in Europe attests to the desperate need for UNRRA's aid. Winter is already aggravating the terrible effects of shortages in food and clothing and shelter. If there should be any break in the stream of relief which UNRRA is supplying, the toll among children, among the aged, the ill, the undernourished, and even among the hardest fighters for freedom in the liberated lands, would be an appalling one—an indelible reproach to all of us who escaped suffering and turned our backs upon those who endured it in a common cause.

The truth is that the stream of UNRRA's relief is very seriously threatened. It seems nearly certain now that the organization will receive the long-delayed \$550,000,000 pledged to it a year ago as part of the initial American contribution. But this sum will be entirely exhausted by the end of this year. UNRRA's resources must be refreshed by another contribution from all the nations which escaped the ravages of invasion. The United States, wealthiest among these, is asked to contribute again an amount equal to about 1 percent of our national income, \$1,350,000,000. The Foreign Affairs Committee of the House has already recommended the authorization of this amount. It must still be acted upon, however, by the House as a whole and by the Senate. And once the authorization has been adopted, an appropriation measure must pass both Chambers.

The trouble is that Congress plans to recess in just 3 weeks' time. If it is to furnish UNRRA the money needed before its Members go home, it will have to act with resolute dispatch. There is no time left for politicking, no time for the broaching of irrelevant amendments attaching strings to UNRRA's use of the American contribution. If the money is not made available by the end of the year, UNRRA will simply be unable to buy the supplies needed for shipment to Europe and Asia. If there is an interruption in the flow of these supplies, the price will inevitably be paid in human life.

It takes about 2 months to translate an order for supplies into actual delivery of relief to the needy. In the case of goods which have to be manufactured or processed, the lag between order and delivery may run anywhere from 2 months to 8. And UNRRA cannot order without money. This is the grim, inescapable situation. Congress has 3 weeks' time in which to answer the voices of Europe's children and of their mothers and of the men toward whom we look to build democracy upon the ruins of war. These will be but quiet voices. Perhaps they will not be heard in Congress above those that clamor for special conditions and delay. But unanswered, their echoes will haunt all our nights and days for many a year.

UNITED STATES SENATE RESTAURANT, FRIDAY,  
NOVEMBER 30, 1945

#### LUNCHEON MENU

Appetizers: Clam cocktail, 30 cents; shrimp cocktail, 50 cents; Lynnhaven cock-

tail, 35 cents; celery and olives, 35 cents; leopard melon, 20 cents; pineapple juice, 15 cents; fruit cup, 25 cents.

Soups: Senate Restaurant bean, cup, 10 cents; bowl, 15 cents; Boston clam chowder, cup, 10 cents; bowl, 15 cents; oyster stew, 40 cents; in cream, 60 cents.

#### SIXTY-CENT LUNCHEON

Fried fillet of sole, tartare sauce; parsley potatoes, green salad; or boiled frankfurters and sauerkraut, parsley potatoes, assorted breads.

Choice of apple cobbler, frozen custard, or ice cream; tea or coffee.

(1) One-half roasted stuffed squab chicken, candied sweetpotatoes, old-fashioned turnip greens, \$1.

(2) Sea food en casserole, steamed rice, green salad, 90 cents.

(3) Baked eastern salmon, hearts of lettuce salad, parsley potatoes, 70 cents.

Desserts: Fresh apple pie, 15 cents; cup custard, 15 cents; cup cakes, 10 cents; apricot pie, 15 cents; layer cake, 15 cents; ice cream or sherbet, 15 cents; blue cheese, 25 cents; Camembert cheese, 25 cents; Liederkranz cheese, 25 cents.

Beverages: Coffee, 5 cents; tea, 10 cents; Coca-Cola, 10 cents; milk or buttermilk, 5 cents; 7-Up, 10 cents.

No substitution on the above.

#### SHIPPING AND PERSONNEL PROBLEMS IN THE EMBARKATION CAMPS IN EUROPE AND THE PACIFIC—ABSENCE FROM THE SENATE

(During the delivery of Mr. DONNELL's speech:)

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on the 9th day of November, I submitted a resolution (S. 188) calling for an investigation of the shipping and personnel problems that have developed in the embarkation camps in Europe and in the Pacific and requesting that this investigating committee have on its personnel a number of enlisted GI's.

Since that date, under the guidance of the distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], a number of meetings have been held with officers of the Army and the Navy, including General Paul, head of the personnel of the War Department, and Admiral Denfeld, Chief of Bureau of Navy Personnel.

When I submitted the resolution, I stated that the apparent difficulties were between Washington and the Pacific and between Washington and the Atlantic. I still think this is the case, as the Army and Navy officials in Washington have been most cooperative in their endeavor to do all they can to facilitate the return of soldiers and any investigation that we are conducting to that end.

This morning I attended a meeting with the chairman of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee at which were present members of the Army and Navy shipping branches and of the War Shipping Administration. I found these men particularly alert to the problems of the transportation of personnel from Europe and from the Pacific. They advised the chairman and myself that they were virtually "over the hump" in the matter of returning personnel from the Atlantic, and during the month of December will complete the lifting of available military personnel from Europe. They advised



further that at the present time shipment of available personnel has been completed from the Mediterranean theater. During the month of December they anticipate transferring 31 ships with a carrying capacity of 76,420 troops from the Atlantic to the Pacific—and, in fact, this has already started—so that during the month of December there will be a sufficient number of ships in the Pacific to lift all available men. Senators will note that I use the words "available men." Availability of these men is based upon reports of the area commanders in the Pacific, and does not necessarily mean the number of men who are eligible for discharge. The Shipping Administration is basing its efforts on the number of men reported as available by the area commanders.

I think, now that we are approaching the position where there is availability of ships, the number of men in the Pacific should be made available for the maximum amount of shipping that can be employed in returning them to the United States. I intend to ask that reconsideration be given by the area commanders to the number of ships available. In other words, until such time as the high-point score of the majority of the men overseas is equivalent to the high-point score of those being discharged in the United States, I feel there should be no relaxation in the effort to make available every ship for the transportation of personnel home. At the present time there are in the Pacific 515 ships with a carrying capacity of 829,283. This will be augmented in late December and early January by the 31 ships from the Atlantic with a capacity of 76,480. A few Navy combatant ships will be retired so that the total lift capacity in the Pacific will be only slightly larger than it is today.

I have been informed that the shipping situation on the island of Okinawa has materially improved since the 15th of November and that today it is nearly equal to the number of men available and released for transportation by the area commanders.

Mr. President, an opportunity has been presented me to visit Europe and speak directly with representatives of enlisted GI's from various embarkation camps and centers in France next week. As a member of the Senate Aviation Committee, I have been asked to be a guest of the TWA in their preview flight of the air liner *Constellation*, inaugurating their domestic flight from Washington to Paris. The air liner will be christened by Madam Bonet, wife of the French Ambassador, at 2 p. m., Monday next, and the plane will leave for Paris at 2:30. The acting chairman of the Senate Aviation Committee has nominated me to represent that committee on this flight. At my suggestion and with the approval of the chairman of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, the War Department in Washington has been kind enough to send dispatches to Europe requesting that enlisted GI's in the various embarkation camps select representatives totaling about 25 to meet me next Tuesday or Wednesday afternoon in Paris. In addition, the War Department is making arrangements for me to visit as

many camps as I can during my brief stay there. I expect to utilize this opportunity to get the enlisted man's point of view of the demobilization.

I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate next week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent of the Senate is granted.

#### BRITISH MILITARY POLICY IN PALESTINE

(During the delivery of Mr. DONNELL's speech:)

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of introducing something into the RECORD and making a brief statement with relation thereto?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask permission to make certain insertions in the RECORD, and in connection therewith to make a statement dealing with the subject of Palestine, which is now a matter of large concern. I visited Palestine 2 years ago as a member of the senatorial committee, and also discussed the matter in London. During the past summer I saw the conditions in Europe which are bringing about such earnest consideration of Palestinian problems.

If in this brief statement there seems to be something which indicates that I am indulging in the American pastime of twisting the British Lion's tail, let me say only that my comments upon British policy can be supported by citations of such eminent authority as Winston Churchill and Hon. Herbert Morrison, the present leader of the House of Commons under the Labor government, who have used very much more caustic phraseology than I do in characterizing the obtuseness of the British Colonial and Foreign Office in dealing with the situation in Palestine, an obtuseness which seems to be somewhat contagious so far as our own State Department is concerned. I trust that a clarification of public thinking on this matter by more complete reports may conduce to a solution which will not only solve the very pressing problem of Palestine, but, as I conceive it, serve the long-range interests of American foreign policy as well.

It is well known that about 50,000 British troops have been concentrated recently in Palestine. The impression which British official circles are trying to create is that the only reason for the presence of these troops is the fear of Arab or Jewish disorders in the country. It is proper, therefore, to point out that the British Government has been concerned about a place which could be used as a British military base in the Middle East. The Egyptians have come to resent bitterly the continued presence of British garrisons, and the British Government has realized for some time that in all probability it will be obliged to remove its troops from Egypt. An attempt was made to develop Syria as an alternative British military base, and British Government circles hoped that with the elimination of France from Syria, the local government would enter into a special treaty with Great Britain permitting the use of that country as a British military base. The British hopes in this

respect seem to have been not justified. After getting rid of the French with British assistance, the Syrians and Lebanese turned around—with possibly some discreet diplomatic assistance from the United States—and made it plain that they did not wish to give Britain any privileged status in their countries.

In the circumstances, the British Government has apparently decided that Palestine is the only country on the east coast of the Mediterranean where they would be able to maintain in permanence large military forces. This they perhaps consider essential to their military interests, as was indicated by Hon. Herbert Morrison in the British House of Commons some years ago in discussing the very problem of Palestine, and as was indicated by Winston Churchill when he, too, was a critic of that government—perhaps as essential as we consider bases in the Pacific, if not more so. As a result, about 50,000 troops have been concentrated in Palestine, largely from Syria and Egypt.

It may be a matter of relative indifference to the Jews whether Britain wishes to use its special position in Palestine in order to station there a large number of British troops for imperial reasons. But what is most unfortunate is the apparent attempt of the British to mislead public opinion, both in Great Britain and in this country, as to their reasons for having those troops in Palestine, and to put on the Jews the blame for a purely, or primarily, imperial policy. By now, the families of British soldiers stationed in Palestine have been led to believe that the Zionist issue is what prevents their sons and brothers from being demobilized and returned to their homes. They have been led to believe that the presence of British troops in Palestine is necessary either in order to defend the Jews from Arab onslaughts, or in order to prevent illegal activities and violence on the part of the Jews, and that therefore it is the Jews who stand in the way of the reunion of English soldiers with their families. The situation has led to a great deal of resentment on the part of the English public, and is bound to lead to greater resentment and to an increase of anti-Semitism.

Herbert Morrison in the House of Commons, before he was its leader, stated that negligible numbers of troops would be required in order to preserve order in Palestine, at a time when there was as much ground for concern as exists at the present time. In private conversations with many, there has been an intimation by British officials that the main reason why the British cannot agree to the opening of Palestine to the Jews, or even to the admission of the 100,000 refugees requested by President Truman, is that such a policy would lead to large-scale Arab attacks against Jews, which would have to be repelled by British troops, at the cost of lives. This argument is especially used by British propagandists in this country, who add that if the United States urges Great Britain to embark on this course the United States must share the risk by sending large numbers of American troops to Palestine.

As I have already indicated, both Winston Churchill and Herbert Morrison have indicated that the fear of widespread Arab violence over Palestine is absolutely imaginary; but assuming for a moment that such a danger exists, it is proper to point out that a logical solution might be the stationing of neither British nor American troops in Palestine, but the recall to Palestine of more than 30,000 Palestinian Jews who are now serving in various formations of the British Army outside their country. If any soldiers should risk their lives because of a policy of which Jews would be the direct beneficiaries, it is grossly unfair that British or American soldiers should be asked to bear these risks. It is only fair that the Jewish soldiers from Palestine should do so. Such a solution was, in fact, suggested by Herbert Morrison himself in discussion in the British House of Commons. The British Government, however, has refused to return to Palestine these Jewish formations. It seems evident that the argument of widespread Arab violence is not believed by the British Government, but is merely being used as an excuse for not undertaking a course which they do not wish to undertake as a matter of policy.

Another interesting point may be made. While British representatives in London and in Washington spread the impression, through newspaper articles and otherwise, that they are anxious to have American soldiers participate in the occupation of Palestine, and even create the impression that the American Government has been asked to participate but has refused, there is what is apparently reliable information to the effect that no such request, either formal or informal, has been made by an official British representative of any official American representative. On the contrary, fully aware that sharing the responsibility for a territory means sharing control and authority over the territory, the British Government has carefully refrained from making any such suggestion to the Government of the United States, rumors and newspaper reports emanating from British sources to the contrary notwithstanding. Thus the British are able to saddle the American Government with the seeming responsibility for failing to cooperate with the British Government, whereas in fact the British Government has no desire whatsoever to seek or welcome such cooperation.

The joint Anglo-American Commission is intended apparently to saddle the United States with a share in the moral responsibility for a British policy in Palestine, but there is no desire to allow the United States an effective voice in deciding Palestine's future. It is understood that there is a desire or aim on the part of Great Britain to obtain from the United Nations Organization a trusteeship over Palestine and to have it declare Palestine a British security zone under the United Nations Charter. If such an arrangement were to come about, Great Britain would be as free, if not more free, to pursue its own policies in Palestine as it was in its capacity as a mandatory of the League of Nations.

The power which Great Britain exercises in Palestine at the present time derives in no way from the Balfour declaration, but simply and solely from the mandate given to it by the League of Nations and by the treaty made with the United States Government, under which Britain obligated herself to carry out the specific provisions of the Balfour declaration. Certainly the trusteeship or the mandatory or the treaty of the United States can not be modified by any authority less than that which bestowed the obligation or authority. The obligations of Great Britain and the United States to carry out the terms of the agreement can not be modified by the President of the United States or by any other authority less than that which created the obligations, which was the action of the United States Government, through its constitutional authorities, the President, the Senate, and, as a matter of fact, in that instance the whole Congress of the United States.

Meanwhile there are serious reports which it seems to me should be most informative to the American people and to the Congress of the United States at this time as it is considering the resolution regarding Palestine. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record, as a part of my remarks, three or four press reports which, so far as I know, have not been widely brought to the attention of the American people. They emanate from apparently reliable sources, and they refer to conditions prevailing in both Palestine and Tripoli, where recent Jewish riots have created increasing concern.

There being no objection, the press reports were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### REPORT FROM TRIPOLI

Seemingly reliable information from Tripoli, by way of Egypt, indicates that the British commanding officer in Tripoli, Brigadier General Temple, and his deputy, Colonel Merter, played the strangest possible part during the recent Tripoli disorders, a part which makes it impossible to absolve the British authorities from serious responsibility in connection with these disorders.

Until recently, Arabs in Tripoli did not dare do harm to Jews. Even under some of the worst days of Axis domination in north Africa, when German forces were in control of the situation, the Arab population was aware of the serious view which the authorities would have taken of any mob violence against the non-Moslem parts of the population. Accordingly, Jews and various European groups were left unmolested.

Any desire that may have existed among certain elements of the Arabs as an aftermath of the Nazi occupation to molest the Jews was rapidly dispelled by the arrival of British forces, among whom Jewish formations from Palestine were very noticeable. The Arabs gained the impression that the Jews were respected allies of the British, and this was sufficient to nip in the bud any temptation to engage in anti-Jewish activities.

Apparently recently, however, various Arab elements in Tripoli gained the impression, through their frequent contacts with General Temple, Colonel Merter, and other British officers in Tripoli, that, with the cessation of hostilities in Europe, the alliance between the British and the Jews was over; that the British no longer needed the cooperation of Jewish manpower from Palestine; and that, therefore, the British were no longer interested in the treatment of Jews in Tripoli.

As a result of this impression, coupled with agitation by emissaries of the Pan-Arab League, whose identity and presence in Tripoli were well-known to British authorities, a pogrom was organized in the Jewish quarters in Tripoli on Sunday, November 4. The organizers of the pogrom spread the word that the British authorities would not interfere. Indeed, the Jewish quarter in Tripoli was attacked and 40 Jews were murdered on that day. And the military authorities did not interfere. No curfew was declared in the city, and no exceptional measures were taken either to arrest the known ring leaders or to prevent the recurrence of disturbances.

This attitude of the British authorities was considered a clear encouragement by the organizers of the disorders. On Monday, November 5, they once more broke into the Jewish quarter of the city and several dozen Jews were again slaughtered. And again no effective measures were taken by the British authorities to prevent the recurrence or further spread of the disorders.

On the third day, when word of the peculiar attitude of the British authorities spread throughout the country, similar disorders took place in various villages, and looting of Jewish property extended throughout western Tripolitania. In those places where there were no Jews, and to some extent in Tripoli as well, the mob attacked Italians and other Europeans. It was only on that day that Brigadier Temple ordered a curfew in certain parts of the town. Significantly enough, he curfewed only the center of the city, sending patrols to the Christian and European quarters. Native and Jewish quarters remained unpatrolled, thereby making it possible for mobs from the native quarter to continue assaulting the Jewish quarter. The slaughter and looting of Jews continued unabated.

It is understood that Brigadier Temple is trying to justify his attitude on the grounds that he did not have sufficient police forces to patrol effectively the entire city. It should be stated, therefore, that he had full authority to use troops as well as police for the purpose of ensuring public order, and that, had he done so, he would have had all the manpower he needed. It should also be noted that in the disposal of the police forces he and his subordinate officers chose to leave undefended that section of the city and of its population which were threatened most.

On the same day the commanding general performed another act which throws a clear light on his attitude toward the disorders. He demanded that the heads of the Arab community express their regret for the disorders in writing. This they promptly did, and the pogroms continued. No other steps were taken by the British authorities to deal with the ringleaders of the disorders.

On the other hand, the Jewish rabbis were gathered by the British commanding general and severely chided for the anti-Jewish disorders. The British authorities demanded that they, the leaders of the attacked community, repudiate the disorders, thereby giving to outside observers the impression that the disorders were not a one-sided, unprovoked attack upon the Jews, but a two-sided conflict for which the Jews bore an important part of the responsibility.

It appears from the attitude of the British authorities in Tripoli that their conduct at the time of the disorders is connected with a threefold objective of British policy in that community:

(a) The British try to impress the local Arab population with the fact that they take the Arab side as much as possible in every controversy. This is done in order to get the local Arab population to favor British trusteeship over Tripolitania.

(b) The British authorities in Tripoli seemingly proceeded on the theory that a show of anti-Jewish violence would not be unwelcome to the British Government, as



evidence that the Arab-speaking world is very bitter about Jewish claims to Palestine. In order that this impression should percolate to the outside world, it was essential that the anti-Jewish disorders should not be stopped on the first day, but should be permitted to last for some time. As long as the Jews alone were the victims of the Arab mob the British, therefore, adopted a policy of noninterference. But when the mob started getting out of hand and looting the property of various European groups, the British stepped in and prevented further spread of the disorders.

(c) By calling upon the heads of both the Moslem and the Jewish communities to repudiate the disorders, the British authorities managed to maneuver themselves into their favorite position of trying to be the fair and impartial judge between two opposing groups, an impression which they thought to convey, through newspapers correspondents and otherwise, to the outside world.

[From the Jewish Telegraphic Agency Bulletin of November 26, 1945]

#### BRITISH TROOPS ARREST JEWISH LEADERS IN BELSEN CAMP FOR PROTEST ON PALESTINE POLICY

PARIS, November 25.—Leaders of the Central Jewish Committee in Bergen-Belsen, in the British zone in Germany, have been arrested for protesting against the new British policy on Palestine, it was revealed in a report received here today from the committee.

The blue-white Zionist flag was mishandled by British military policemen and thrown onto a heap of garbage, the report said, and a crowd of Jews, including many women, which gathered when a police car arrived to take away those arrested, were beaten by British military police with rubber truncheons.

The arrests were made on November 16, when the protest against the Bevin statement was to have been submitted to the British authorities in Belsen during the distribution of Red Cross parcels scheduled to take place on that day. However, the German administrator of the camp, G. Grande, notified the military police of the plan and later appeared with British M. P.'s whom he asked to arrest Marian Lipke, the president of the Jewish committee.

As soon as they arrived the military police immediately removed banners bearing inscriptions in English reading: "Open the Gates of Palestine," which had been erected by the displaced Jews. Then, acting on the advice of the German administrator, they arrested not only the president of the Jewish committee, but a number of other leaders of the committee and several of its personnel. They then took the blue-white flag from the office of the committee and threw it into a pile of garbage 60 feet from the office.

#### JEWISH CAMP OFFICE RAIDED—TYPEWRITERS AND CORRESPONDENCE SEIZED

Meanwhile, many of the thousands of Jews who are still in the Belsen camp gathered together and voiced their protest against the German administrator. The military police then let loose with their rubber truncheons, striking at random at men and women.

Several hours later British troops, led by Grande, returned to the camp and arrested another member of the Jewish committee, two young cholutzim and three Jewish girls, without explanation. They later returned, for a third time, and searched the office of the committee, seizing several typewriters, correspondence files, and accounting ledgers.

No information concerning those arrested can be obtained, except it is known that during their interrogation at the headquarters of the military police one was struck twice by a German policeman in the presence of a British officer.

[From the Jewish Telegraphic Agency Bulletin of November 11, 1945]

#### PALESTINE GOVERNMENT CHARGED WITH ARMING ARABS AND INCITING THEM TO ATTACK JEWS

JERUSALEM, November 9.—The serious accusation that the Palestine Government has been arming Arabs and inciting them to attack Jews, made by the secret radio of the Jewish resistance movement, has finally been brought into the open.

In the last few months there have been many reliable reports of such activity on the part of the Palestine Government, but those who were aware of them, and had investigated, were reluctant to aggravate the situation by writing an exposé. Actually the story has not appeared in the Palestine newspapers, and the Government therefore sees no reason to deny the charges. And, of course, the people who have the evidence cannot risk coming out into the open.

One authenticated instance of the administration's efforts to create trouble between the Arabs and the Jews involves Abdulla Khalil el Shoiikh, commander of a Hebron gang which played a prominent role in the disturbances of 1936. Abdulla Khalil had been hiding since 1936, but last year the Palestine authorities let it be known that they had no objection to his returning to Hebron, which he did.

At the same time, he received magnanimous assistance from the authorities in the way of agricultural machinery and livestock. Two months ago he was approached by a Palestine Government agent and reminded of his obligations. At this time, the former Hebron gang leader was asked to organize the Arabs in that area into an armed force for the purpose of "resistance to Jewish aggression." Assurances were also given him that all the financial aid and the firearms and other equipment necessary would be forthcoming.

#### ARAB VILLAGERS RELUCTANT TO ENGAGE IN RIOTS: FEAR CONSEQUENCES

It is reported reliably that Abdulla Khalil el Sheikh at first was not too anxious to assume that task. But finally he was convinced, and he is now organizing and training Arabs with modern weapons. Five weeks ago a deputy inspector of the Palestine police visited Kilonia, which is near Hotza, a Jewish community not far from Jerusalem, and gathering all the Arab villagers together he told them that, according to trustworthy information, the Jews were preparing to attack the Arabs. He advised the Arabs to arm and not to await an attack but to go after the Jews themselves. The deputy inspector indicated that all the necessary arms were available. The villagers, however, did not stir, refusing to take the inspector seriously.

For the time being, the disinclination of the Arab villagers to become aroused and incited offers the most serious handicap to the plans of Palestine government officials, whose only solution to the Palestine problem apparently is to set Arabs and Jews against one another. The inability of these officials to guarantee to the Arabs that no legal action would ever be taken against them, in the event of disorders, also holds back the Arabs.

Psychological warfare is also being used by the same Palestine government officials. This correspondent has seen leaflets, typographically excellent and in Arabic, which call upon the Arabs to be prepared to rise without delay. "The Jews are arming themselves to the teeth," one such leaflet says. "The Jews plan to conquer Palestine and neighboring countries," states another.

A whispering campaign also reveals that experienced manipulators are operating in Palestine among the Arabs, just as the Allies did against Germany, and vice versa. The

most persistent of these rumors deal with King Ibn-Saud—whispers about the size of the forces that Ibn-Saud, ruler of Saudi Arabia, has ostensibly promised to send to the aid of the Palestine Arabs; and these whispers make the rounds of the Arab villages with well-organized regularity.

This line is necessary to arouse Palestine Arabs, who are still reluctant to fall in with the anti-Jewish schemes of mysterious visitors who say they are from the government. When the Arabs in Nablus showed absolute apathy toward the Jewish danger, stories of Ibn-Saud's horizon-filling hordes, who were reportedly poised on their horses ready to dash in on a holy crusade, immediately started to be spread among the villages in that area.

The Jewish underground radio, in discussing similar incidents and tactics, charges that the Palestine government is trying to arrange outrages and attacks, with Arabs set against Jews and Jews against Arabs, so that when the "two peoples of Palestine fight, the British will enter the fray and prevail over both sides, punish both sides, and appear to be playing the role of impartial judge."

[From Jewish Telegraphic Agency Bulletin of November 29, 1945]

#### FOURTEEN JEWS KILLED, ONE HUNDRED WOUNDED IN PALESTINE WITHIN FORTNIGHT; BRITISH SUFFER NO CASUALTIES

JERUSALEM, November 28.—It is now possible to discern both in the British and the Jewish behavior a distinct pattern since the statement November 23 by Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin on Palestine in the House of Commons.

In less than 2 weeks, 14 Jews have been killed by the British, including 2 women and a boy under 16, while nearly 100 people have been shot, including an 8-year-old. All this violent suppression has been accompanied by the classic excuse that shots from the crowds provoked a reply. Yet despite the reputation for deadly and accurate assaults built up by the terrorists, not a single British soldier or policeman has been seriously hurt in the clashes with the public.

On the other hand, the Jewish activities indicate a plan of attacks upon specific targets where minimal forces can be engaged as, for example, in the selection of such meaningful targets as the government offices at Tel Aviv—in protest against the Bevin pronouncement—and the attacks on the coastal stations this week in retaliation for the capture of a schooner carrying immigrants without entry permits.

Aside from such sharply limited attacks, which are definitely to be classified as carried out by resistance forces organized in quasi military cadres, the Jewish answer to the British is obviously taking the form of passive mass resistance. The Tel Aviv demonstrators last week did not reply as an organized mass to the attacks by British troops, while the tactics of passive resistance were most obviously demonstrated by the events yesterday which were exactly paralleled in two separate areas.

In both cases, thousands of Jews with no arms and with nothing in their hands, attempted to stream into the collective farms which had been surrounded by troops, simply to demonstrate their solidarity. Although the British communicate today declares that a horseman led the colonists toward Givat Chayim and that other Jews opened fire from the flanks of the soldiers, there is not a single instance of a casualty among the troops as evidence of any firing.

#### THREE HUNDRED JEWISH SOLDIERS REPORTED SEPARATED FROM BRITISH DIVISION SENT TO PALESTINE

Witnessing events at Givat Haim where British troops fired at Jews, and witnessing also the picking off by rifle fire in the Tel

Aviv streets of people who could have been dispersed by the simplest means—such as the use of streams of water—convinced this correspondent that the armed forces here, while they are acting with the utmost restraint, are, nevertheless, firing unnecessarily. Perhaps these troops were overtrained in the expectancy of a general armed uprising.

The report is current here that 300 Jewish soldiers of the Sixth Airborne Division were separated from that detachment before the outfit entered Palestine. The main body of troops are also said to have been politically briefed along lines that the Jews, having now been given a homeland, want to establish a state by force. It is noteworthy that violent antagonism toward the Jews has been expressed by nearly all the soldiers with whom this correspondent has talked.

#### JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE, IN CABLE TO BYRNES, ACCUSES BRITISH OF INTRODUCING REGIME OF TERROR IN PALESTINE WITH VIEW TO INTIMIDATING JEWS

NEW YORK.—The British administration of Palestine was accused of "introducing a regime of terror with a view to intimidating the Jews of Palestine into submission to the white-paper policy and the cessation of Jewish immigration" in a cable sent to Secretary of State James F. Byrnes from Jerusalem by the Jewish Agency for Palestine. This was announced today by the American Zionist Emergency Council, which received a copy of the Jewish agency's cable this morning.

The cable discloses that 6 Jews were killed and 50 others, many of them children, were wounded by British troops and police in Tel Aviv last week, "although not a single shot was fired by Jews." The cable also charges British forces with forcibly entering three peaceful Jewish agricultural settlements, wantonly beating hundreds of men and women, killing four persons and wounding many others "without any reason or provocation."

The message requests Mr. Byrnes to "bring the above information and our solemn protest to the notice of the United States Senate and House of Representatives."

The text of the Jewish agency's cable to Secretary of States Byrnes follows:

"British troops and police forcibly entered three peaceful Jewish labor agricultural settlements, wantonly beat hundreds of men and women; shot and killed four persons; wounded many others without any reason or provocation, and although settlers and numerous friends from neighborhood who assembled there were entirely unarmed. Forces also smashed furniture and damaged huts. This comes after shooting in Tel Aviv last week of 6 Jews dead and wounding 50 others, many of them children under 10, although not single shot fired by Jews. Impression growing mandatory government is introducing regime of terror with view intimidating Jews of Palestine into submission to white-paper policy and cessation Jewish immigration. Respectfully request bring above information and our solemn protest to notice United States Senate and House of Representatives."

"JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE."

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRIGGS in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Finance:

Harry A. Zinn, of Denver, Colo., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 47, with headquarters at Denver, Colo., to fill an existing vacancy.

#### RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, December 3, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 30 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

##### UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidate for appointment in the regular corps of the United States Public Health Service:

Floyd S. Daft to be senior scientist, effective date of oath of office.

##### MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Col. Clark Kittrell, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission, under the provisions of section 2 of an act of Congress approved June 28, 1879 (21 Stat. 27; 33 U. S. C. 642), vice Col. Malcolm Elliott, relieved.

##### IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Charles A. Lockwood, Jr., United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 5th day of October 1943.

Vice Adm. Charles H. McMorris, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 23d day of September 1944.

Vice Adm. George D. Murray, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 29th day of November 1944.

Vice Adm. Jesse B. Oldendorf, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 7th day of December 1944.

Vice Adm. Daniel E. Barbey, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 9th day of December 1944.

Vice Adm. Frederick C. Sherman, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 13th day of July 1945.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord God, shouldst Thou lead us into paths unknown, we would do Thy will with hearts sincere; we would live up to the capacities of our highest natures and become the true friend of man. Bearing the image of our Holy Creator, O keep us free from wanderings in the spiritual world, from the chains of a false tradition, and from the masks which disfigure the reality of true manhood and womanhood.

Forsaking old fears and prejudices, let us measure ourselves by Thy law of moral integrity, of uprightness and honesty of purpose; these alone will stand in

the face of relentless attack. On the great sea of life, the Christ is on the headlands to help and serve struggling men. As we hear the matchless melody of the upper world and sense the rare beauty of the measure of human life, let men lift up their souls in praise.

*Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord? or who shall stand in His holy place? He that hath clean hands and a pure heart; who hath not lifted up his soul unto vanity, nor sworn deceitfully. He shall receive the blessing from the Lord, and righteousness from the God of his salvation.*

Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 1862) entitled "An act relating to rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WALSH, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. TOBEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had ordered that Mr. SMITH be appointed a conferee on the part of the Senate to the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4129) entitled "An act to provide for reorganizing agencies of the Government, and for other purposes," vice Mr. FERGUSON, excused.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROWN of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Atlanta Journal of November 27 and an editorial appearing in the Atlanta Constitution of November 28 in eulogy of the gentleman from Georgia, Representative ROBERT RAMSPECK.

#### REVISION OF REMARKS

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday during the consideration of the appropriation bill the gentleman from Missouri and I engaged in a colloquy over a certain item in that bill, during which he made inaccurate statements, with which I took issue. Upon reading the RECORD today you will find the entire colloquy has been deleted. As far as this House and the public is concerned, it just did not happen.

I recognize the gentleman from Missouri as being a colossus of parliamentary maneuver and procedure. He wrote the book. I also recognize the fact that the gentleman from Missouri in this instance has adroitly and again in typical manner clothed himself with the mantle of



parliamentary protection. But I want to say here and now that I am going to watch, and watch very eagerly, to see whether or not that colloquy is put back in the Appendix of the RECORD where it is supposed to be put, because I serve notice on him and on anybody else that I do not need anybody to take my remarks out of the RECORD, nor do I need anybody to correct them. I think this practice of deleting another Member's remarks without his consent or permission is something which should be stopped immediately. Let the gentleman from Missouri dare attempt to cross out a single letter or strike a single word from what I have just said. I put him on guard against any such transgression of my privileged field. He may have the power of knowledge of all the rules, regulations, circumventions, short cuts, curves, and manipulations of parliamentary conduct, but he does not have the power to stay my own voice and my own expression. That power belongs to me, and me alone, and I intend to keep it without his aid or assistance.

Perhaps the incident is unimportant, but the principle involved is of the utmost importance. The RECORD should reflect only what takes place on this floor and not what some Member would like for it to reflect in his favor.

Yes; let us keep the RECORD straight.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein two editorials, one from the Manchester Union entitled "Hurley's Resignation," and the other from the New York Herald Tribune entitled "The Muddle."

#### TRANSPORTATION HOME FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. KUNKEL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT FOR VETERANS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, if the veterans are to continue to receive the preferential treatment that a grateful Nation is very anxious to continue to accord them, they have to be careful they do not become dupes of unscrupulous and vicious people. I say this because my attention has been called to one of the worst rackets I have ever heard of, namely, dealers in heavy equipment are giving veterans a few dollars to exercise the preference the Congress gave them under the surplus-property law to obtain this equipment. After they get it, they turn it over to the dealer who makes an unconscionable profit on it. It seems to me our veterans ought to be very careful lest public sentiment turn against them if they permit themselves to become the tools of racketeers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GIBSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I have for today be postponed until Wednesday of next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### TRANSPORTATION HOME OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, a serviceman in Calcutta, India, wrote to me and wanted to know why the education of 50 Indian so-called students, between the ages of 22 to 45, coming to America on the steamship *Torrens*, was more important than the return home of 50 eligible GI Joes who were homesick and would like to see their families and complete their educations in their homeland. So, 50 return tickets to the United States were not honored by our War Department and responsible officials assigned to the duty of returning those men.

I do not want any more explanations from departments, bureaus, and officials that we are doing everything possible to get the serviceman home. I want to know why tourists have priority to travel from India now on a troopship to the United States and why 50 GI Joes were left in India with a canceled return ticket, and who gave orders to have those 50 United States citizens replaced with 50 Indian so-called students. I want to know why 50 GI Joes were suddenly classified as less important than 50 Indian students, and who considered them such. I want the War Department and responsible officials to use every available shipping space for the return of our soldiers and I want it done now and continued until the job is finished.

#### FAVORITISM IN THE DISCHARGE OF SERVICEMEN

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include three short newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SPRINGER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### WHO RUNS THE GOVERNMENT?

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a copy of H. R. 2827 and the directives of the Selective Service Board.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. McDONOUGH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an item from the Sylvian Bee.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I had a special order, but the hour was so late that I deferred using it. I ask unanimous consent for the same special order, to address the House for 30 minutes on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### FAVORITISM IN THE DISCHARGE OF SERVICEMEN

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter I have sent to the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I have been one of the Members of this House who have defended the basic soundness of the point system for discharging men from the armed services, but I have repeatedly said that the point system should be carried out impartially as originally planned, and should be free of glaring exceptions which have recently been made.

I have today sent a letter to General Vandegrift, Commandant of the Marine Corps, in which I asked three questions which I wish to raise on the floor of this House: First, why should young McNider be shown such favoritism? Second, are sons of prominent military officers in a class by themselves? Third, does a recommendation from General MacArthur supersede all other regulations, and place an individual in a privileged class?

I hope we will soon have the answer to those questions.

The complete text of my letter is as follows:

NOVEMBER 30, 1945.

Gen. A. A. VANDEGRIFT,  
Commandant,  
United States Marine Corps,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL VANDEGRIFT: I wish to emphatically protest the release of Pfc Jack MacNider from the Marine Corps.

Every Member of Congress has had requests for release of boys from service so they might continue their education. All of the services have repeatedly stated that such action would disrupt the point system and be unfair to thousands of men with high points who should be released first.

I have been one of those Members of Congress who have defended the point system as basically fair to our valiant men and women who served their country so well in this war. But I do not believe we can honestly defend the point system when such rank favoritism is shown in the MacNider case.

You know better than I that there are thousands upon thousands of high-point men in the Pacific sweating it out, waiting impatiently for ships and planes to bring them home. Many of them are men with families who have not seen their children for several years.

Why should young MacNider be shown such favoritism? Are sons of prominent military officers in a class by themselves? Does a recommendation from General MacArthur supersede all other regulations and place an individual in a privileged class?

The Marine Corps' action in this instance certainly is not helpful to the morale of those still in service, or their relatives. It breaks down the faith of the people in their Government.

I sincerely trust there will not be a repetition of this grossly unfair action.

Sincerely yours,

ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,  
Member of Congress.

#### RELEASE OF PHYSICIANS AND DENTISTS FROM THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include as a part of my remarks three telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, students from foreign nations can apparently get transportation to the United States to enter our educational institutions. Why not be just to our own boys?

Why ignore the future public needs for physicians and dentists by depriving our boys now in the service of an opportunity to obtain an education, especially those who aspire to enter these essential and honorable professions?

Under leave to extend, I am including three telegrams:

TUCSON, ARIZ., November 29, 1945.

The Honorable DANIEL ALDEN REED,  
Republican Representative from  
the State of New York,  
House of Representatives:

Congratulations on stand you have taken with reference to immediate release of medical and premedical students from the armed forces. It is no fault of the council of education of the American Medical and American Dental Associations that at least a limited number of these boys have not continued their studies during the entire war. If we

are to preserve the health of the Nation after winning a great struggle it is most essential that we continue to educate scientists, physicians, and dentists immediately.

DR. PAUL H. BENNETT,  
Past President Arizona State Dental  
Association, President Arizona  
State Board of Dental Examiners.

CHICAGO, ILL., November 29, 1945.

HON. DANIEL ALDEN REED,  
House Office Building:

Congratulations on your criticism of discharge of Pvt. Jack MacNider, just another case of favoritism to the privileged class: I wish you success in your demand for immediate release of all medical students. My son has completed his premedical studies but was not permitted to enter medical school last month. Although classified for limited service only, he is now loafing at the naval research laboratories, Washington, D. C.

FRANK L. FRABLE.

WASHINGTON, D. C., November 29, 1945.

Representative REED of New York,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:  
Noticed story about General MacNider's son and your demand that all medical students be released from service. I consider any such release rank favoritism. My son is a marine in Japan and has more than 50 points, then why should he not be released. He has not finished his college education.

MRS. FREDERICK WITT.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from the Administrator of the Surplus Property Administration.

#### THE ARMY-NAVY FOOTBALL GAME

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JOHNSON of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### EFFECT OF STRIKES ON VETERANS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include in my remarks a short statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MICHENER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### PURCHASE OF INDUSTRIAL ALCOHOL FROM CUBA

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the current purchasing of sugar from Cuba, and of which I am not complaining, it has been reported that our Government contemplates purchasing blackstrap molasses at a very high price and that consideration

is also being given to purchasing Cuban industrial alcohol.

I have written the Secretary of Agriculture urging that our Government refrain from entering into competition with private enterprise for these commodities. Private business should have that opportunity.

We have tremendous stock piles of alcohol and most ample capacity for industrial alcohol manufacturing in our own country.

We now have millions of bushels of soft corn in the Midwest that can be converted into alcohol. This soft corn will not keep in cribs come springtime, even heated or moldy corn will still make industrial alcohol.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Daily News of yesterday.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from one of his constituents.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he intends to make today in Committee of the Whole and include excerpts.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include correspondence and an editorial.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he is going to make today in the Committee of the Whole and include certain excerpts and certain statistics on the power question.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the Farm Journal.

Mr. MCCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a very informative letter received from the Civil Service Commission, together with his reply thereto.

Mr. MCCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a brief letter received from Brig. Gen. Miles Reber relative to displaced persons in Europe of Polish blood.

#### WITHHELD COLLOQUY

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HEBERT] called your attention to his remarks having been expunged from the RECORD, without his permission, by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. On Tuesday, November 27, I had the same experience.



On page 11045 of the RECORD there should have appeared a colloquy between the gentleman from Missouri and myself. Without asking my permission he deleted from the RECORD the colloquy and the remarks I made. I think that is an unfortunate practice and I trust it will not happen again.

#### THE AMERICAN RED CROSS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement furnished by Mrs. Mabel Boardman of the American Red Cross.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE FROM TODAY UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], if he can give us any idea on what day next week the bill for establishing a Medical Corps in the Veterans' Administration, H. R. 4717, I believe it is, will be taken up?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to advise the gentleman now because the program has not as yet been made up. In all frankness, I will advise the gentleman that I doubt very much whether we will be able to bring that bill up next week.

Mr. RANKIN. I cannot understand why not. It is an emergency matter. It is very vitally necessary that the bill be passed as quickly as possible.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree with the gentleman. There is no dispute about that.

Mr. RANKIN. Because we are unable to get the doctors that we need in these veterans' hospitals. The doctors who are coming home from the Army are becoming discouraged and going into other fields of practice, and the sooner we pass this measure the sooner the Veterans' Administration will be able to supply adequate and efficient doctors for our veterans' hospitals. I hope the gentleman will reconsider this proposition. There is not any legislation coming before this House next week, or at any time, that is of more importance than this bill for a Medical Corps for the Veterans' Administration, and I hope that he will reconsider and give us an opportunity to bring it up early in the week and pass it without delay.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is nobody more interested in the veteran than I. The gentleman from Mississippi has not a monopoly of the interest of the veterans. Nobody is more interested in the welfare of the veteran than I am, and all the Members of the House have an

interest in them. I announced last week that I would try to get the bill up this week. We did not expect that the pending bill would take as long as it has. In the meanwhile the Committee on Rules reported a rule on the First and Second War Powers Acts, and even if the gentleman disagrees with my judgment—and I respect his views in disagreement—I think it important that those measures be taken up immediately.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman's statement a while ago about my not having a monopoly was not altogether courteous. I do not profess to have a monopoly, but I am charged with a responsibility and I expect to carry it out.

Mr. McCORMACK. I, too, am charged with a responsibility, and I expect to carry it out, and I have the courage to carry it out.

Mr. RANKIN. How about taking it up tomorrow then? I will take it up tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have made a unanimous-consent request. The gentleman can object to my unanimous-consent request if he wants to, and I shall announce now that if we meet tomorrow, in view of the situation that exists, there will be no legislative program.

Mr. RANKIN. All right. Then in advance you announce you will not take it up tomorrow. Then what is the use for me to object and have the House meet?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am telling the gentleman frankly that there are a lot of other Members interested in the situation. If the gentleman wants to object, that is his privilege.

Mr. RANKIN. I will not object under those conditions, but I want to tell you now that this House is going to be in session every day next week and every day from now on until this legislation is passed.

Mr. McCORMACK. And I want to state this, that as quick as possible the bill that the gentleman has referred to will be taken up. There has been no delay in trying to bring it up, but I consider that the First and Second War Powers Acts are of paramount importance, and I think the taking up of UNRRA is of paramount importance. The gentleman disagrees with that, and I respect his views in disagreement.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course I do.

Mr. McCORMACK. As soon as possible after those matters are disposed of, the bill the gentleman refers to will be taken up, and I assure the gentleman it will be taken up without delay.

Mr. RANKIN. I think we should investigate UNRRA first.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present. Without objection a call of the House is ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

#### [Roll No. 193]

Anderson, Calif.	Drewry	Norton
Baldwin, Md.	Fernandez	O'Konski
Barden	Gearhart	Patman
Barry	Gerlach	Pfeifer
Bell	Gillie	Poage
Bennet, N. Y.	Granger	Quinn, N. Y.
Bloom	Hart	Rayfield
Bradley, Mich.	Heffernan	Reed, Ill.
Brehm	Henry	Rich
Buckley	Holmes, Mass.	Robinson, Utah
Campbell	Horan	Roe, N. Y.
Carlson	Huber	Sabath
Celler	Jackson	Sadowski
Chapman	Johnson, Okla.	Sheridan
Courtney	Keefe	Slaughter
Crosser	Kelly, Ill.	Smith, Va.
Curley	Keogh	Snyder
Daughton, Va.	King	Somers, N. Y.
Dawson	Kinzer	Starkey
Delaney	LaFollette	Stevenson
John J.	Lewis	Weiss
Dickstein	Luce	Winter
Dingell	Martin, Iowa	Wolcott
Dirksen	Morgan	Wood
Doughton, N. C.	Murphy	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 351 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. McCORMACK further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4805, with Mr. THOMASON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday there was pending an amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], on which there are 20 minutes' debate remaining.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As I understand it, after the 20 minutes' debate there will be a vote on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman already has that permission.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, none of the flood-control projects in this amendment will be located in the State of Wyoming, but we are interested in this legislation because

we furnish the water that causes the damage. Every major stream in the West has its headwaters in Wyoming. Twelve million acre-feet of water leaves our State each year. A good deal of that water finds its way to the Pacific Ocean, but most of it flows eventually into the Atlantic. We furnish about 5,000,000 acre-feet of water each year to the Missouri River Basin, and every spring that river roars down and destroys millions of dollars' worth of property and kills many people. Our State is primarily interested in reclamation. We had our differences with the Army engineers, whose main concern is flood control. Last year the Congress made a division of the responsibilities between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers on the Missouri River. The Bureau of Reclamation handles irrigation projects and the Army engineers handle the flood-control projects. We now have a well rounded out program. Both of those agencies are experienced and in their respective fields each does a mighty good job. Each needs about the same amount of money. The work of one supplements the other. If we do not pass the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, we are going to open the door to those people who believe in "authority legislation" and who want to superimpose over the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers a new superorganization. We are opposed to the Missouri River authority, and I hope this amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be adopted by all means.

The contention that we ought not to spend this money on these projects now because of the financial condition of the Treasury is not sound. The very ones who are opposed to spending this money now for this improvement are ready to spend money abroad with which for other nations to do the same thing.

Only about one-third of these projects will produce any power. One Member objects to one project because he says it is 90 percent power. My objection to the amendment is that it does not have more projects that will develop the water power of this Nation, the greatest wealth we have on this continent outside of the soil from which we live.

I entered this fight for the development of the water power of this Nation many, many years ago. At that time we were using only 40,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year. The power interests told us then that we had more power than we needed. They are telling us that now. Last year we used about 250,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, and we do not have as much as we need. We will need more and more as time goes on. I predict that within less than 15 years from the date of the close of this World War II the American people will be using half a trillion kilowatt-hours a year, and long before the turn of the century it will take a trillion kilowatt-hours a year to meet their demands. I hope the amendment is adopted. Let us develop the water power of the Nation and sup-

ply it to the people at rates they can afford to pay.

Let us supply it to every farm home in America at those rates, and make this the rightest and brightest country on earth in which to live.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I had an opportunity to express myself on the amendment that is now before us and which has been debated at great length. I refer to the amendment to H. R. 4805 introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER]. On yesterday through inadvertence my remarks showed in the Record that the amendment had been offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

In view of some of the statements that have been made since I expressed myself in support of this amendment, I desire again to reiterate my support of this amendment to the rivers and harbors flood control, and so forth, provision of the first deficiency appropriations bill.

The Army engineers of the War Department and the Bureau of the Budget had approved \$25,516,000 for rivers and harbors projects for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and \$81,759,000 for flood control generally for numerous flood-control projects throughout the United States and also \$15,000,000 for flood control of the Mississippi River and tributaries for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946. This amendment would add approximately \$125,000,000 for rivers and harbors and for flood control generally and for special flood control of the Mississippi and its tributaries.

The subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, made up of 11 members, Republican and Democrat, who made a thorough investigation of this whole subject and all of these projects by a vote of 10 to 1 reported these items favorably to the full Appropriations Committee; but the full Appropriations Committee cut out all of these sums for rivers and harbors and flood control on the theory, as I understand, that further investigation and screening should be made to eliminate such projects and the majority of the members of the Appropriations Committee felt should not be included in the bill.

This amendment restores those items that were stricken from the bill by the full Appropriations Committee.

We are unable to say if there are any items in the bill that should not be there. As I understand it the opponents of this amendment have pointed out only one project of the great number of projects that in their opinion should not be included. It must be admitted that the overwhelming majority of these projects are feasible and economically sound, and the construction of them would be helpful to the country as a whole.

As I recall there are approximately 380 of these projects. We might add here that each and every one of these projects have been heretofore approved by the engineers of the War Department and by the Congress itself. This bill does not create any new projects; it merely appropriates this sum of money to be used in developing and carrying out the declaration and wishes of

the Congress, heretofore expressed. It is passing strange that the Appropriations Committee did authorize the appropriation of approximately \$70,000,000 for reclamation projects throughout the country but denied funds in this bill for the improvement of our rivers and harbors and these hundreds of flood-control projects. We cannot understand this discrimination.

Among these projects that had been approved by the Congress itself, by the Corps of Engineers of the War Department, and by the Bureau of the Budget is Wolf Dam on the Cumberland River and for which approximately \$8,000,000 has been already appropriated and expended.

#### CUMBERLAND RIVER PROJECT, WOLF CREEK DAM

After being approved by the Corps of Engineers of the War Department, the Congress in 1938 established the Wolf Creek Dam project on the upper Cumberland River. Congress made the first appropriation for this improvement in 1941, and as pointed out in my remarks yesterday, this improvement was carried on until 1943. The foundation 5,700 feet long, and nearly 2,000 feet wide at the base, together with a lot of other work had been done. It was stopped because of the war and the scarcity of necessary materials, as well as workmen to carry on the construction. The Government has acquired thousands of acres of land and has made other constructions and developments on this project costing approximately \$8,000,000 to this date.

The Corps of Engineers of the War Department, and the Bureau of the Budget, and the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee recommended and urged an appropriation of an additional \$4,000,000 to carry forward Wolf Creek Dam to June 30, 1945.

Early in the 1920's the people in several counties in my congressional district and in adjoining Tennessee congressional districts became very active to secure the improvement of the Cumberland River. Many meetings were held and at some of these meetings there were as many as 2,000 delegates from the various counties in Kentucky and Tennessee strongly urging this improvement and development and this project was formally dedicated by the people of Kentucky and Tennessee in that section about the year 1941. That section of Kentucky and Tennessee was cut off in a way from railroad transportation as well as sufficient highways. The people were bottled up as it were and the development and progress of that section was greatly hindered because of the lack of transportation and destructive floods.

This project can be used for power purposes. That section has a great deal of raw materials in the way of timber, coal, oil, and agricultural commodities. There is a great deal of suitable labor accessible. It is believed by the people generally of that section, and I share in that belief that this will bring many industries that will provide jobs for the people and a market for their raw materials. Much of the land has been sold and titles transferred to the Government and the people have for several years planned their economy in that section owing to the ac-



tion of Congress with a view that this project would be completed and if it is not completed it would greatly disorganize and disrupt the people and their activities in that section of Kentucky and Tennessee.

Believing that this project will be helpful to the people of Kentucky and Tennessee in the way that we have set out above and in providing flood control and transportation on the Cumberland River, I shall vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] and have this item and others cut out by the Appropriations Committee restored to the bill. Unfortunately, we are in this position. We must vote for the whole bill or against meritorious projects, like the Wolf Creek Dam project on the Cumberland River. It is hoped that if there are any projects that are not feasible or economically unsound that those projects will be screened out when the Senate takes the bill up and will have ample opportunity to make further careful investigation, but I wish to reiterate that the engineers of the War Department and the Congress have heretofore declared that the projects for which these appropriations are sought have been found to be feasible and sound economically, and that these findings have been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and by the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee that had all of the facts connected with these projects and approved them by a vote of 10 to 1. Perhaps the full committee of the Appropriations Committee did not have the opportunity to know all of the facts as did the subcommittee or as did the engineers of the War Department, the Bureau of the Budget, or the Congress when it disapproved these projects. No one of the opposition made any claim that the Wolf Creek project was not feasible or unsound.

I trust that this amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment had been offered a few short weeks ago in this House it would have been overwhelmingly defeated.

It would have been defeated because every Member of this House knew we were in a fight to win the war and that local consideration must be subordinated to the national interest. No brand-new \$2,000,000,000 program for Federal public works scattered all over this country, some of it good, some of it bad, some of it for essential flood control, much of it for nonessential power, would have had the slightest chance of being adopted.

Today we are still in a fight, a fight to win the peace and to preserve the solvency of this country of ours. If that fight is to be won, unjustifiable expenditure must be eliminated.

I do not believe the adoption of this program as a whole, the good and the bad, can be justified at this time in this bill. I think the program demands further study and further screening. In order to obtain that further action, it is essential that this amendment be defeated and that the matter be referred

back to the regular committee. Thereafter any urgent projects can be taken care of promptly by special resolution from that committee.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I have already been heard twice by the Committee of the Whole with reference to this subject matter. When I secured the allocation of an additional minute and a half I anticipated that, perhaps, in the further course of the debate some arguments of an ostensibly logical nature calculated to appeal to fair-minded Members of the House desiring to act in the best interests of the country as a whole might be advanced against the amendment, to which it would be possible for me to reply. No such argument has been advanced. I feel that I can contribute best to the happy conclusion of the pending controversy, which I confidently anticipate will be a vote for the amendment in a few minutes, by yielding back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART].

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, for many years Wister Dam Reservoir has been authorized by the Government, and \$1,000,000 is included in the Snyder amendment for starting the construction of this flood-control project. I am enthusiastically for this amendment. I feel that with the Members of Congress I have talked with, and I have tried to talk with most of them, that it will be but little doubt of its adoption.

This section of the State has been neglected for flood control except for the Red River Dam in another State, all down through the years. This will be the first money authorized in this section, where erosion from high waters has sanded and destroyed the most fertile lands of the Southwest. Farming has become unprofitable and will continue so until the onrushing waters of such tributaries as the Poteau River are harnessed at the headwaters.

Mr. Chairman, this will be a bright day for the people of Oklahoma, particularly to those in the mountains I love so well.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I want to again point out the fact that this is the beginning of a \$2,100,000,000 flood-control program—a 6-year program of \$350,000,000 a year. On page 798 of part 1 of these hearings I asked General Robins this question:

How much do you propose to spend on this 6-year program?

General Robins answered as follows:

We proposed to spend in the neighborhood of \$350,000,000 a year for 6 years.

That amounts to \$2,100,000,000.

I have heard argument after argument made that we should vote for these good projects despite the fact that there are some bad ones included in the total number. I cannot go along with that

proposition. Not a Member on the floor of this House has ever come to me in the 9 years that I have been on this subcommittee but has received friendly treatment and I have cooperated with him on anything that he came to me about if I could do so. I have supported flood-control item after flood-control item without there being one project in my State or district. But I cannot go along with this. I cannot vote for this flood-control amendment on the argument that because we are giving money to China or because we have UNRRA or because of what we are spending abroad, as some seem to think, we ought to spend more on flood control. This bill ought to go back to the committee. Our subcommittee is meeting on January 8. We can then screen out the bad projects and take up these smaller projects and others which are entitled to consideration and which are not in this bill. This program commits us to an expenditure of \$103,000,000 for 1945 on old projects before we can put in one new one. The \$350,000,000 a year is four and a half times the average spent over the last 5 years. The average over the last 5 years was \$80,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment now before us has been under discussion for the past 3 days. Therefore, for the benefit of those who may read the Record it may be appropriate to restate the purpose of the amendment and the circumstances under which it is brought to the House for consideration. It has been a policy of the Government for a great many years to assist in the development of navigation in our rivers and harbors, and to control floods in navigable rivers, to preserve properties and to prevent the loss of lives of people living near such streams. A number of projects had been approved and were under construction or development when the war began, and appropriations for their completion were discontinued during the war. In the meantime, other projects were considered, surveys made, and hearings conducted before the River and Harbors Committee, as well as the Flood Control Committee. The justifications in a number of cases were sufficient to warrant favorable consideration by these committees. Quite a number of projects were favorably reported to the Congress and many of them approved and appropriations authorized, but appropriations for their construction were delayed. Following the cessation of hostilities about 125 of these projects were submitted by the President to the Bureau of the Budget and estimates to complete some and to make plans for beginning others were submitted to the Congress for consideration. The proposals were referred to the Deficiency Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee for attention. The subcommittee in turn referred the estimates to the committee known as the Civil Functions Committee, also of the Appropriations Committee. This latter committee conducted hearings for a few weeks and submitted its

report back to the deficiency subcommittee, recommending that appropriations totaling approximately \$121,000,000 be made for 119 projects. The deficiency subcommittee decided not to include any of the proposals in the bill and the amendment now before us is for the purpose of inserting these various items in the bill and having the estimates approved.

Forty-five or fifty speeches discussing the matter have already been made, some in favor and some opposed to the amendment. It was my privilege to discuss the proposal at some length in general debate last Tuesday. Since then, several speeches have been made in opposition to the amendment. I have listened to all of them with a great deal of interest and concern. Those opposed to the amendment allege: (a) "There are some projects in the amendment without merit"; (b) "that to make the appropriation would greatly endanger our national economy"; and (c) "that some of the projects are solely for the purpose of generating electric power."

It will be observed that most of those opposing the amendment are among the ablest debaters of the Congress and practically all of them say, "There are a number of projects included in the amendment that are wholly without merit." Yet, it will be observed that not one of the speakers so far has endeavored or undertaken to name the projects to which they refer as being without merit, with the exception of one and that has been referred to as the Bug Island Dam on the Roanoke River and the defect or demerit referred to is that it is largely a power project. Further than this, not a single opponent to this amendment has pointed out a single project he considers as being without merit. I know, you know, and every other Member here knows, that if there were a project in this amendment without merit these able debaters would necessarily have to know the defect in the proposal and before they could make a convincing argument it would be necessary to name the proposal that is without merit. It is no argument to rise and proclaim to the House there is one project, two projects, or many projects in the list without merit, unless the person making the statement is able to state specifically the defect or the demerit to which he refers.

In other words, it is not a very convincing argument simply to say, "There are some projects listed in this amendment that are not meritorious," unless you are prepared and willing to state specifically to what project or projects you refer. This is particularly significant when we all know there is not a project included in this amendment that was not first thoroughly surveyed by Army engineers and recommended by them as being a project worthy of the consideration of the Congress. That is, it is a project they consider will be worth more to the people than the estimated cost. We know further that before either of the committees to which I have referred would consider any of the projects eliminated a full and complete report from the investigating agency of the Government would have to be submitted to such committee. We know further that before the committee

would take action it would conduct hearings, where the testimony and justifications would be recorded and published for the benefit of the Congress and the public. We know further that every project referred to herein was submitted to the Congress, to the House of Representatives, where every Member was charged with the duty and responsibility of familiarizing himself with the justifications before casting his vote for or against it, and we also know that every one of these projects had been voted on and approved, not only by this body, but by the Senate at the other end of the Capitol and by the President of the United States. Now it seems to me that if any of these projects had been without merit the defects would have been detected before or when the Bureau of the Budget recommended an appropriation for any such project, and I insist that before any Member of the Congress should undertake to say that any one of these projects is not meritorious he should be able and willing to show the Congress where the defect or defects lie.

I can appreciate the next argument, which is to the effect that we have an enormous public debt, and we should use every effort to avoid unnecessary appropriations, because, as the chairman of the committee has said, and wisely said, this country must be prepared to pay the interest on the bonds that have been sold and redeem them when they come due. I subscribe to this idea, and I think my record here in the Congress will prove it, but I am not unmindful that there is such a thing as false economy. There are times when we may be "penny wise and pound foolish," and the bill now under consideration may well illustrate the idea. It carries a deficiency appropriation of \$1,131,000,000 in round numbers. Of this amount, approximately \$928,000,000 is for veterans' insurance, which is an obligation that must be met, but there remains in the bill approximately \$400,000,000 to be used, as I pointed out a few days ago, largely for paying salaries and administrative expenses in various governmental agencies that may not be of as much importance or value to the economy of this country as the construction of the various projects carried in this amendment. In other words, the items now in the bill to which I have made reference will add little or nothing to the Treasury of the United States, where there must be funds to pay the interest and principal on our indebtedness, but if these projects are constructed they will be wealth-producing activities or agencies; they will increase the wealth of the Nation and will thereby be contributing to our national economy and adding something to the Treasury to be used in paying the interest on our national debt and possibly some of the principal. That is, from the standpoint of national economy, I think it would be much better, wiser, and more businesslike if we were to deduct \$121,000,000 from the \$400,000,000 referred to and eliminate the items for salaries, administrative expenses, and so forth, which will add little or nothing to our national economy, and substitute this amount to be used in the completion or the con-

struction of the projects named in this amendment. If this country is to pay its debts and the Congress is going to devise ways and means by which they are to be paid, we should be inaugurating programs that will increase wealth, enlarge our national economy, and add to the income of our Treasury. It is not sufficient to spend money, but it is highly important that in the spending someone, somewhere, should be creating wealth and thereby contributing to the economy of the Nation.

The next argument is that some of these projects contain provisions for the creation of electric power. My information is there are 13 of the 125 projects referred to provide for the production of power incidental to flood control and navigation, but I find in every case I have studied that where power is provided for it is shown that there is not a surplus of power but on the contrary, there is a demand for power on the part of the people who live in those communities. It must follow, therefore, that if these projects are completed and there is a demand for additional power some of it will necessarily lend itself to the establishment of new industries and new enterprises that will be engaged in creating additional wealth and, to that extent, be contributing something to our national economy.

Some may say that I am particularly interested in the matter for the reason that one of the projects referred to touches my district. I plead guilty to the charge. I have been interested in such a project now for nearly 20 years and the project that touches my district has been surveyed, analyzed, studied, and investigated by practically every agency in the Government and it has received the enthusiastic support of everyone. Thorough investigation has been made into the justifications. So far, the Army engineers have insisted, the construction of the Clarks Hill Dam will practically eliminate the possibility of floods for 200 miles on the Savannah River. They have said it will contribute to the national economy by the increase of navigation for a distance of 200 miles on that river from Augusta to Savannah, Ga. They have said this for the last 6 or 8 years and no one has been able to deny or refute their statements or conclusions. The Federal Power Commission has said there is a pronounced scarcity of electric power in that section and that every kilowatt to be generated by that project can be used without competing with any existing power system. No one has appeared before any committee of the Congress or any agency of the Government undertaking to deny or refute these conclusions. If the project is completed, I not only look for dozens of new enterprises and industries, but I look for hundreds of them to be established in that area and I look for them to thrive within a radius of 50 to 75 miles from where this dam is to be constructed. I look for these enterprises and industries to make a substantial contribution to the wealth of the Nation and add substantially to the Treasury of the United States, where funds are to be used in making payments on our national debt. Mr. Chairman, this country must increase or enlarge its wealth-producing activities if we expect



to be prepared to meet our obligations when they become due. Therefore, it shall be my purpose to support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a deficiency bill is supposed to take care of emergency items. Here comes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] with an amendment that puts into action about two or three million dollars of emergency items and \$126,000,000 of items that will take a long time and a large development. The hearings upon those things are very meager and they are very unsatisfactory. They involve an enormous number of projects which require the flooding of acres and acres of productive land. I am receiving letters from all over the country on that subject, saying that the engineers have not yet given them a hearing on the subject.

There are items like this Buggs Island deal, where the folks involved say there is \$100,000,000 of flood damage, and the engineers say there is \$207,000 a year annual benefit from getting rid of floods.

We have that same picture with reference to every one of these great big items. Outside of that two or three million dollars that is involved, there is not a single thing that is of an emergency character. We should not at this time, with meager hearings, with a lack of proper consideration of the items, only 80 pages of hearings all together by the engineers, vote \$128,000,000 for projects of all kinds and descriptions, almost all of them of a permanent and nonemergency character, without the slightest bit of justification.

Let it go back to the committee. Let them allow those things that really should be allowed as an emergency, but not the others.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, advocating reclamation and grateful for the support of the sponsors of reclamation for flood control, I am on solid ground when I maintain that the arbitrary action of the Committee on Appropriations in including in the pending bill some \$77,000,000 for reclamation, with power development in many of the projects, and the denial of one thin dime for flood control and rivers and harbors is an inexcusable blunder and should be promptly corrected.

The pleas for economy and further investigation by the opponents are without merit. The denial in December and substantially promised approval in January is not economy. Moreover, Members will not be misled. They know that civil function bills have not been approved on the average for the past 9 years until June 1. They recall that national flood control appropriations were discontinued by directive L-41 by the War Production Board in October 1943. Members were assured that appropriations would be made following the war. A delay of 6 months means the loss of lives, the loss of property, and delay means human hardships.

The plea for further investigation falls of its own weight. All flood-control projects are thoroughly studied and investigated by the Corps of Engineers. They must be authorized by Congress before they are eligible. The pending projects have been recommended by the President, the Director of the Budget, and the subcommittee that has always reported flood control and river and harbor appropriations. Advocacy of further investigation is by opponents of projects that have already been fully investigated and approved. No one denies with respect to any of the projects, and particularly with respect to the projects that provide for the development of power in connection with flood control and navigation that the benefits will not exceed the costs. No one asserts that the power developments will not be self-liquidating. Mention was made of a hearing in connection with one of the projects. There is nothing unusual about the hearing. The Corps of Engineers generally, when requested, after appropriations are made, arrange hearings to advise interested persons as to details.

The severe criticism of Members for following the Budget recommendations of the President and the subcommittee in charge are not only most unfortunate, but indefensible.

We believe in fairness; we oppose discrimination. The arguments of the opponents are fallacious. They favor the bill with provisions for initiating reclamation projects; they are condemned by their own acts. The appropriations are available until expended. It will take years to complete some of these projects. Projects that were discontinued should be renewed. Other worthy projects should be initiated. There is no reason why reclamation projects should be initiated and flood control projects delayed.

Whether it was so intended or not, the action of the Appropriations Committee flouted the expressed will of the people of the United States who have spoken in no uncertain terms for national flood control, as well as the established policy of Congress. The Committee on Appropriations is the servant and not the master of the House.

I call upon the membership to correct one of the greatest mistakes ever made by the Committee on Appropriations by restoring to the pending bill the Budget recommendations as approved by the subcommittee on civil functions for flood control and rivers and harbors, and thus provide for the resumption and initiation of worthy flood control and river and harbor improvements.

Under leave granted, I intend to say that formerly flood control was confined largely to levee protection. In response to the national demand, reservoirs are being constructed to detain the floods where they originated. A national flood-control policy was first adopted in 1936. It has been expanded and liberalized in the succeeding years.

Reservoirs require the flooding of lands. In all of the States, lands may be condemned by utility companies for power developments. If lands can be condemned for such purposes, it is unreasonable that they should not be condemned to protect people and property

from overflows. Where the lands are cultivatable or arable, the same situation obtains in practically all of the States. Land owners object to their property being condemned to protect downstream areas. All water developments, whether canals, levees, diversions, floodways, or dams, require that the property of some be condemned for the general good and for the general welfare. In all flood control the yardstick is the same. Owners are compensated for the value of their property taken.

It is to be regretted that some Members are confused with respect to the local contributions and with respect to the applicable laws.

Members should be reassured when they recall that no projects are embraced in the pending bill and no projects are authorized unless the Chief of Engineers reports that the benefits will exceed the costs. Confusion arises from the fact that prior to the adoption of the national policy, the requirements for Government participation were formerly more rigid. Annual and successive floods, with the expanding population, have resulted in the liberalization of views respecting benefits. The general welfare is being more carefully considered.

All flood-control projects have been carefully studied and all alternatives have been explored. No project is authorized in the pending bill unless the chief of engineers reports that the benefits exceed the costs and unless Congress has previously authorized the projects. In the district that I represent, projects have been authorized along the Yazoo-Tallahatchie-Coldwater River system and about half of them have been completed. They will protect 1,500,000 acres of valuable and productive land. The same laws that govern the operation of these projects obtain with respect to all other similar projects in the United States. All other alternatives have been explored before the final project is adopted. Every other method has been investigated and discarded.

In all flood-control projects, whether along the Mississippi River, the Sacramento, or any other river, the local interests are required to furnish the right-of-way for levees and flood walls, and in all flood-control projects since 1938 the Government pays for the flowage rights for reservoirs. The yardstick for local contribution in all projects is the same. The same law is applicable to all projects.

I know that valuable lands are acquired for building dams for the generation of power, but power is essential to progress. The remedy is to compensate. If lands can be condemned for the development of power, I repeat to emphasize that it is more important to the general welfare that they be condemned to protect the lives and property of the people of the country. If there are valuable lands in the district of any Member, the Member should keep in mind that there are no more valuable or important valleys between the two oceans than the valley of the Tennessee River, yet for the development of power primarily the entire Tennessee Valley has been converted into reservoirs.

I have advocated legislation to protect and to safeguard the rights of land owners. I have insisted that the State laws for condemnation should be applicable to condemnation in the Federal courts. I have insisted and promoted from the beginning of reservoirs for flood control, that the rentals from lands in the reservoir sites be utilized in reimbursing the school and road districts for taxes lost.

Sponsoring and advocating flood control to protect the lives and property of the people that I represent, I have urged comparable protection for all of the people of the United States. I have insisted upon a sound policy. I have urged that all projects be sound and in the future, as in the past, I will continue to insist that citizens whose property is acquired for flood control and river and harbor improvements be compensated as provided for all public improvements, whether they be highways, drainage ditches, canals, levees, floodways, or reservoirs.

I have advocated and supported through the year sound-flood control projects in which the benefits exceed the costs with the same local contribution applicable to all projects, where required. So that all parts of our common country are accorded the same treatment and consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] is recognized.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me it is not an unreasonable request when a responsible committee of the House asks the House and the Committee of the Whole to give it a little more time that it may do a job well as it ought to be done. Now, let me say this to you, and I make no exception, there is not a committee of the House of Representatives that has had the load to carry in the last 4 or 5 years that the Committee on Appropriations of the House has had. During the war it was appropriating and trying to sift out billions of dollars to be appropriated. As soon as the war was over we had to start on the rescission program. Our deficiency subcommittee has been in session every day almost—Saturdays, Saturday afternoons, holidays, and every other time—working diligently to try to carry out its mission.

What happened? We have not discriminated against anybody, we have not turned down any flood control, but here we had on a deficiency bill sent to us by the engineers, a power program. It is not a flood-control program. Analyze it, do not take my word for it. It is a power program. And if you pass it and it goes into law, it gives the Federal Government in power-operated plants more potential kilowatts than you already have in all of them that are in existence today. How do we do it? It got sandwiched in there, sugar-coated around a lot of very meritorious flood-control programs that ought to be carried.

What do we ask you to do? We ask you, because we did not have time to go into it in a deficiency bill, we asked you to lay that aside in order that the regular committee of the House, when it

meets in January, may go through it and bring back a well-considered program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired; all time has expired.

The vote will come first on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment. In the first place I wish to explain that the first paragraph is covered by the Snyder amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EBERHARTER to the amendment offered by Mr. SNYDER: Strike out the figures "\$81,759,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$84,759,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, as I have said, most of us, if not all here in the House, are intensely interested in economy and retrenchment and cutting down the drain on the Treasury. We have already made considerable headway in that respect. However, there are certain activities of the Government which must be carried on in the postwar period if we are to maintain our economy, keep our workers employed, and keep up the national income on the basis that will permit the collection of sufficient taxes to maintain the Government and keep it out of bankruptcy. One of the activities which is important in such a program is the development of our natural resources so that they may be made to produce and add to our national income. Either the Flood Control Committee or the Rivers and Harbors Committee has carefully considered every one of the projects included in the Snyder amendment. After exhaustive hearings and favorable reports by the Corps of Army Engineers, the projects were approved. They will not only provide employment during the process of construction for many of our returned veterans and workers released from war industries, but will add to the total of production in the postwar years. This, of course, will increase the national income and will help to keep our country on an even keel economically. The Congress has approved immense appropriations from the Federal Treasury in the way of lend-lease, UNRRA, and other expenditures overseas and it is time now when the war has ended to look after our own household and make provision for the employment of our folks here at home.

The hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations on this bill set forth on pages 4, 5, 6, and 7, volume II, the projects covered by the Snyder amendment, including also the few projects that have been eliminated. These projects fall in several groups, the first group covering "Maintenance and

improvement of existing river and harbor works—supplemental estimate for fiscal year 1946, new work." The second group covers "Flood control, general—Supplemental estimate for fiscal year 1946." The third group covers "Projects requiring additional funds for advance planning in fiscal year 1946."

The following is a list of the projects which were reported to the Appropriations Committee:

TABLE I.—Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works—supplemental estimate for fiscal year 1946, new work

Project	Amount
Connecticut River below Hartford, Conn.....	\$75,000
Hudson River, N. Y.....	515,000
Great Lakes to Hudson River waterway.....	2,000,000
Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea.....	743,700
Chesapeake & Delaware Canal.....	645,000
Potomac River water front, District of Columbia.....	413,000
James River, Va.....	652,000
Charleston Harbor, S. C.....	185,000
Pearl River, Miss. and La.....	1,573,500
Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn.....	3,439,500
Missouri River at Fort Peck, Mont.....	1,185,000
Monongahela River, Pa. and W. Va.....	2,700,000
Keweenaw waterway, Mich.....	548,000
Racine Harbor, Wis.....	72,300
Lorain Harbor, Ohio.....	131,000
Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y.....	967,000
Oswego Harbor, N. Y.....	571,000
Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, Calif.....	7,100,000
Suisun Canal, Calif.....	160,000
Sacramento River, Calif.....	390,000
San Joaquin River, Calif.....	150,000
Columbia River and tributaries, Celilo Falls to Snake River.....	100,000
Total new work.....	24,316,000
MAINTENANCE	
Chesapeake & Delaware Canal.....	1,200,000
Total.....	25,516,000

TABLE II.—Flood control, general—Supplemental estimate for fiscal year 1946

Project	Amount
Franklin Falls Reservoir, N. H.....	\$80,600
Mountain Brook Reservoir, N. H.....	521,500
Nashua, N. H.....	195,000
Mansfield Hollow Reservoir, Conn.....	1,500,000
Norwich, Conn.....	632,000
Union Village Reservoir, Vt.....	1,000,000
Surry Mountain Reservoir, N. H.....	17,000
Knightville Reservoir, Mass.....	14,000
Hartford, Conn.....	285,000
Winsted, Conn.....	132,500
Springfield, Mass. (Mill River).....	42,000
West Springfield, Mass. (Agawam).....	338,000
Riverdale, Mass.....	403,000
Chicopee, Mass.....	170,000
Holyoke, Mass.....	500,000
Syracuse, N. Y.....	500,000
East Sidney Reservoir, N. Y.....	700,000
Whitney Point, N. Y.....	243,000
Elmira, N. Y.....	1,000,000
Lisle, N. Y.....	240,500
Bath, N. Y.....	295,500
Addison, N. Y.....	331,103
Almond Reservoir, N. Y.....	1,000,000
Canisteo, N. Y.....	250,700
Almond, N. Y.....	30,500
Sunbury, Pa.....	500,000
Williamsport, Pa.....	1,000,000
Wilkes-Barre, Hanover Township, Pa.....	133,000



TABLE II.—Flood control, general—Supplemental estimate for fiscal year 1946—Con.

Project	Amount
Plymouth, Pa.	\$400,000
York, Pa.	218,200
Bugge Island Reservoir, Va. and N. C.	1,000,000
Clark Hill Reservoir, Ga. and S. C.	1,000,000
Allatoona Reservoir, Ga.	3,000,000
Homochitto River, Miss.	15,000
Wallace Lake Reservoir, La.	193,000
Narrows Reservoir, Ark.	1,000,000
Terre Noire Creek, Ark.	100,300
Bayou Bodeau, Red Chute, and Loggy Bayou, La.	65,000
Bayou Bodeau Reservoir, La.	1,000,000
Shreveport, La.	500,000
Blakely Mountain Reservoir, Ark.	500,000
Memphis, Tenn.	1,000,000
Buffalo Bayou, Tex.	1,500,000
Columbus, Tex.	212,300
John Martin Reservoir, Ark.	500,000
Blue Mountain Reservoir, Ark.	1,000,000
Nimrod Reservoir, Ark.	198,500
Clearwater Reservoir, Mo.	1,000,000
Norfolk Reservoir, Ark.	1,000,000
Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark.	3,000,000
Fort Smith, Ark.	853,600
Little Rock, Ark.	548,400
Denison Reservoir, Tex. and Okla.	1,500,000
Canton Reservoir, Okla.	2,000,000
Fort Gibson Reservoir, Okla.	2,000,000
Fall River Reservoir, Kans.	1,000,000
Wister Reservoir, Okla.	1,000,000
Hutchinson, Kans.	500,000
Union Township drainage district levee, Missouri.	47,000
Green Bay levee and drainage district No. 2, Iowa.	49,300
Dry Run, Iowa.	382,500
Lake Traverse and Bois de Sioux River, S. Dak. and Minn.	45,800
Lac Qui Parle Reservoir, Minn.	30,900
Kansas City, Mo. and Kans.	2,000,000
Kanopolis Reservoir, Kans.	1,000,000
Osceola Reservoir, Missouri River Basin, Mo.	1,000,000
Garrison Reservoir, N. Dak.	2,000,000
Council Bluffs, Iowa.	500,000
Omaha, Nebr.	500,000
Hamburg, Iowa.	236,000
Missouri River between Kensler's Bend, Nebr., and the combination bridge at Sioux City, Iowa.	500,000
Schuyler, Nebr.	64,000
Hot Springs, S. Dak.	154,000
Cotton Wood Springs Reservoir, S. Dak.	510,000
Wolf Creek Reservoir, Ky.	4,000,000
Dale Hollow Reservoir, Tenn. and Ky.	1,500,000
Center Hill Reservoir, Tenn.	3,000,000
Chattanooga, Tenn., and Rossville, Ga.	200,000
Brevoort Levee, Ind.	30,000
Muncie, Ind.	70,000
Harrisburg, Ill.	24,500
Golconda, Ill.	29,200
Brookport, Ill.	28,500
Mounds and Mound City, Ill.	500,000
Newport, Ky.	500,000
Delaware Reservoir, Ohio.	1,000,000
Muskingum River Reservoirs, Ohio.	1,500,000
Bluestone Reservoir, W. Va.	3,000,000
Massillon, Ohio.	500,000
Parkersburg, W. Va.	500,000
Dewey Reservoir, Ky.	1,000,000
Dillon Reservoir, Ohio.	1,000,000
Tionesta Reservoir, Pa.	277,600
Mahoning Creek Reservoir, Pa.	360,000
Loyalhanna Reservoir, Pa.	494,000
Youghiogheny River Reservoir, Pa.	573,000
Crooked Creek Reservoir, Pa.	3,000
Conemaugh River Reservoir, Pa.	8,000,000
Punxsutawney, Pa.	500,000
Elkins, W. Va.	500,000
Coal Creek drainage and levee district, Illinois.	500,900
Kelly Lake drainage and levee district, Illinois.	97,900

TABLE II.—Flood control, general—Supplemental estimate for fiscal year 1946—Con.

Project	Amount
Lacey, Langellier, West Matanzas, and Kerton Valley drainage and levee district, Illinois.	\$172,900
Sebewaing, Mich.	241,800
Lancaster, N. Y.	570,400
Mount Morris Reservoir, N. Y.	500,000
Santa Fe Reservoir, Calif.	900,500
Los Angeles River, Calif.	2,000,000
Whittier Narrows Reservoir, Calif.	2,000,000
Big Dry Creek Reservoir and diversion, California.	435,000
McKensie River, Oreg.	62,000
Cottage Grove Reservoir, Oreg.	11,500
Detroit Reservoir, Oreg.	2,000,000
Dorena Reservoir, Oreg.	1,000,000
Mill Creek, Wash.	125,600
Mud Mountain Reservoir, Wash.	257,000
Tacoma, Wash.	700,000
Yakima, Wash.	134,000
Snagging.	500,000
Round-off.	-100
Total	85,159,000

TABLE III.—Projects requiring additional funds for advance planning in fiscal year 1946

Project	Amount
Bennington Reservoir, N. H.	\$30,000
Nashua, N. H.	7,000
West Peterboro, N. H.	8,000
North Andover and Lawrence, Mass.	9,000
North Plymouth Reservoir, N. Y.	100,000
Genegantalet Reservoir, N. Y.	60,000
Philpott Reservoir, Va.	150,000
Boeuf and Tensas Rivers and Bayou Macon, Ark. and La.	150,000
Big and Little Sunflower Rivers, etc.	150,000
East Poplar Bluff and Poplar Bluff, Mo.	15,000
Black River, Poplar Bluff, Mo., to Knobel, Ark.	10,000
Creede, Colo.	5,000
Louisville, Ky.	100,000
Indianapolis, Fall Creek Levee, Ind.	8,000
Indianapolis Warfleigh section, Indiana.	8,000
Bald Hill Reservoir, N. Dak.	35,000
Red Lake and Clearwater Rivers, Minn.	30,000
Kings River and Tulare Lake Basin, Ind. Pine Flat Reservoir, Calif.	
Folsom Reservoir, Calif.	600,000
Table Mountain Reservoir, Iron Canyon site, California.	
Terminus Reservoir, Calif.	
Isabella Reservoir, Calif.	
Harlan County Reservoir, Missouri River Basin, Nebr.	300,000
Panther Mountain Reservoir, N. Y.	50,000
Cahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak.	200,000
Fort Randall Reservoir, S. Dak.	100,000
Tuttle Creek Reservoir, Kans.	200,000
Success Reservoir, Calif.	50,000
New Melones Reservoir, Calif.	125,000
Lookout Point Reservoir, Oreg.	100,000
Quartz Creek Reservoir, Oreg.	150,000
Recreational investigations and plans.	50,000
Total	2,800,000

Mr. Chairman, these projects have been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, Corps of Army Engineers, and, I understand, have the approval of the President. It is important and urgent that they be given the green light so that construction work may be begun without further delay. Many of them have been held up owing to the war emergency. To eliminate them from this

bill does not mean that the Government is thereby saving the amount allocated to the projects but merely that they are postponed to a later day. The whole program of reconversion will be materially aided if the appropriations are made now and the projects cleared for early construction. I trust, Mr. Chairman, that the Snyder amendment will receive the approval of the House.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, anyone who is a sincere advocate of flood control should favor the prompt completion of the Conemaugh River Reservoir. Here is a project which has been authorized since 1937 and which has the enthusiastic approval of the Army engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, and all the Pennsylvania State agencies which considered it.

This reservoir alone would often mean the difference between floods and no floods along much of the Ohio, Allegheny, and Conemaugh Rivers. It would lower the flood crest in the Pittsburgh area by almost 4½ feet. Six other dams have been completed along the tributaries to the Ohio River and all six have only lowered the flood crest by about 5½ feet. It is estimated that 1,375,000 persons in the immediate vicinity would benefit from the completion of this flood-control project. And let me emphasize that the Conemaugh Reservoir is strictly a flood-control project. No power facilities are even contemplated.

Based on a flood crest of 45 feet, which is less than the record flood of 1936, this dam would effect a reduction of over \$20,000,000 in direct damage.

We are assured that the funds for the Conemaugh Reservoir will be included in the next flood-control bill which may be passed some time next year. In the light of that assurance I am puzzled as to why the funds should not be voted now. Since this project is necessary and desirable, why wait 6 or 8 months to start it? Six or eight months may very likely be the difference between one more disastrous flood or no flood at all.

We are asked to believe by the committee that while this dam should be built some time again that we should wait until more millions of dollars of property have been washed away and more lives have been lost before we should start work.

Obviously if this dam should be built it should be started now, not some time later after the horror, inconvenience, and destruction of another flood has compelled action. It will not cost a cent less next year than now, and if it saves lives, suffering, and millions of dollars soon after completion it will have been found to have been a mighty good idea to have started it at once. Nature will not wait even if the committee does request delay for further study.

In a few moments we will vote to amend the Snyder amendment by adding the Conemaugh Reservoir to the list of the projects to be appropriated for. I hope all of you will see fit to support this move, because the Conemaugh project is as meritorious as any flood-control project that ever passed this House. It is the key to flood control in the whole Pittsburgh area.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania which would restore to the Deficiency Appropriation bill now under consideration the amounts of money requested by the Army engineers and approved by the Bureau of the Budget for flood-control work throughout the United States. I think it is especially unfortunate that at a time when we are worried about finding jobs for the returning servicemen we are not making available the money to initiate those projects which have already been considered of sufficient national importance to warrant the approval and the authorization of the Congress. All of these projects have been previously authorized by the flood-control bill of 1944. I am particularly interested in a dam at Iron Canyon on the Sacramento River in California. This dam will protect thousands of acres of land in the fertile Sacramento Valley from disastrous floods. The money requested by the engineers and approved by the Budget is for the purpose of completing the surveys and for the further purpose of studying the problem of salvaging the salmon in the Sacramento River when the Iron Canyon Dam is built. This is a vital matter not only to the district I represent, but to all of northern California and also the fishing industry of the State. Certainly this type of work should not be put off and is appropriately a part of a deficiency appropriation bill. These are all worthy and necessary projects and the matter of timing is of vital importance. We have to get the preliminaries out of the way on these necessary public-works projects in order to be prepared to move swiftly when the full impact of postwar unemployment hits us. I hope the amendment by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be adopted and I intend to support it.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Chairman, I am for economy in the use of Federal funds and have always been. But I do not believe in practicing any economy in which we endanger the lives of our citizens and permit their property to be jeopardized.

In my home State of Louisiana we know as well or better than other sections of the Nation what floods mean. We have experienced many of them, and these disasters have brought death and destruction. Progress has been made in the flood-control fight, but much remains to be done. Vital work has been delayed by the war. Now that the war is over, this work should be and must be expedited. Unless it is, we are certain to have more floods, with all the tragedy they create.

The funds eliminated from the deficiency report by the Appropriations Committee include those for projects upon which the people of Louisiana and other States are depending for the safety of their lives and for their economic welfare. They are entitled to these funds from every angle. It must be remembered that the waters from a great part of the United States sweep down on Louisiana. It is the obligation of the Federal Government to help control these

waters and the waters that invade other States, and I do not see how Congress can conscientiously refuse to grant the necessary appropriation for this purpose. Certainly we are pledged to protect the lives and the property and the rights of all of the people of this great country.

Flood control is a good investment, one of the best. I realize that we have a huge national debt and that we must begin to reduce Federal expenditures. But flood control is not the place to start reducing. I do not intend to vote for appropriations that I consider unnecessary to the general good of the Nation. Of course, we in Congress differ from time to time on the necessity of certain expenditures. Naturally, we are influenced to some extent by our primary interests in our respective home areas. That is only human and reasonable. But fundamentally we are all trying to do the best for the people of the country as a whole. Therefore, I do not see how we can justify the elimination of flood-control funds from this deficiency measure. Certainly the fair-minded and thinking citizens throughout the United States will appreciate the necessity for these projects. Millions of them are looking to us for the relief these projects will afford.

We have just emerged from a war of unparalleled horror and destruction. We appropriated billions upon billions of dollars to win that war—money which was necessary to preserve our Nation and our Government and the American way of life. We also voted that money for the cause of humanity, to help oppressed nations and restore to them the rights which had been taken away by a ruthless foe. We did not seek war, but when it was forced upon us we stood ready to pledge all the resources of this great land to save ourselves and to help others who were stricken through no fault of their own.

The war with Germany and the war with Japan have been won, but the war against floods continues. And it must be continued until every American citizen is protected against flood waters to the greatest extent that is humanly possible.

I am not familiar with details of all of the projects involved in the appropriation under consideration. But I do know quite well the necessity of those pertaining to Louisiana and to my congressional district. I feel sure no Member of the House would question my sincerity as to the needs in my area and I have no right or intention of questioning the sincerity of other Members with respect to the needs in their own sections. Let us be fair to ourselves and to our people.

Now is the time to proceed with these flood-control projects, not only because of their importance to the safety and progress of the Nation, but also because of the great volume of employment they will offer at the very time we are concerned over the problem of creating enough jobs for returning war veterans and other citizens during the reconversion period.

Surely we must economize in every practical way. The people expect us to be vigilant in the use of public funds. But they also expect, and have a right

to expect that we will spend their money for their own good. I know of no better way we can help so many in such an essential manner as we can by completing the flood-control program. I trust that Congress will do its full duty in making this possible.

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I have tried to stand for economy and a balanced Federal Budget during this, my first term in the Congress. There, however, is such a thing as false economy.

Among the items of the deficiency appropriation bill eliminated by the committee is an appropriation of \$1,200,000 to restore the bridge over the Delaware-Chesapeake Canal at Chesapeake City.

During the war this canal was used most extensively by the Government with ships carrying war supplies. Over 3 years ago, one of these ships hit and destroyed the Government bridge over the canal at Chesapeake City. The Government instituted a ferry service which is very unsatisfactory to the general public, and which cost the Government \$285,000 a year in round numbers to operate. This money is just wasted and will be wasted as long as the ferry is operated, and until the bridge is restored, so that the Government has already spent almost as much in ferry service as a new bridge would cost. This bridge is also on the new proposed dual highway, which will eventually run from Elkton to Easton to Cambridge to Salisbury to Ocean City, and be connected with the dual highway from Baltimore to Philadelphia at Elkton.

I sincerely trust that the House will vote to restore this item and the other items which are recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and the War Engineers, and which I am sure are equally meritorious with the Chesapeake City Bridge, with which situation I am completely familiar.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, despite the fact that I agree most heartily with the efforts of the Appropriations Committee to cut appropriations in the interest of the economy, I am constrained to support the pending amendment to restore the miscellaneous group of river and harbor projects and flood-control projects to this deficiency appropriation bill.

We are confronted with much the same problem that we had yesterday, when I joined the majority of the members of the committee in voting for a present appropriation of \$158,500,000 for veterans' hospitals. There surely is no question but what these veterans' hospitals will have to be built, and will have to be appropriated for; and there is, at the same time, no question but what these rivers and harbors and flood-control projects will have to be eventually built and paid for. The only real question is whether we do it now, or do it in January, or some later time. These items are vital for our domestic economy. I have no fear of appropriating money if it is appropriated for sound purposes, and in the aid of our national economy. The thing we must guard against is making wasteful appropriations.

We must cut, save, and economize wherever possible; but it does not make sense to talk about billions for foreign relief and foreign loans, and withhold



millions for the construction of needed and worth-while projects here at home.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, on October 1, 1945, the United States Army engineers announced that they were ready to start work this fall on a number of flood-control projects, all of which have been authorized by Congress. They were selected because of "urgent need, readiness for starting operations, and for geographical reasons, in order that the work may be scattered throughout the United States to as great an extent as possible."

Among the projects listed as ready for construction in the fall of 1945 is one at Syracuse, N. Y., estimated to cost the Government \$2,210,000.

In compliance with Public Law 497, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved April 10, 1936, the Army engineers made preliminary examinations of Onondaga Creek, which runs through the city of Syracuse, with a view to the control of its floods.

On January 11, 1940, the Chief of Engineers submitted his report to the Secretary of War, for transmission to Congress, on the Syracuse project and others in the Oswego River watershed. It is contained in House Document 846, Seventy-sixth Congress. The report stated that "flood hazards seriously affect the economic life and future development of the region and that adequate control measures are urgently needed."

Quoting further from the report:

Syracuse, the largest city in the Oswego watershed, is situated at the southern end of Onondaga Lake. The city is the principal commercial and industrial center in this part of the State. Onondaga Creek, which drains 108 square miles, flows northward through the center of the city. The watershed consists of steep, wooded hillsides, cut by small flashy streams, and a broad, flat valley, which makes excellent farm land. The reservation of the Onondaga Indian Nation is located in this watershed.

In the city, the creek winds through the business district. The channel is confined by many large buildings and a total of 40 bridges, many having limited clearances. The channel of the creek has been paved for about 5 miles above its mouth but has a capacity of only approximately 6,000 cubic feet per second. Above the city, the creek meanders across the valley bottom. In this reach it has a capacity of but 1,000 cubic feet per second, which is frequently exceeded.

The largest flood occurred in March 1920 and had a peak discharge of 6,000 cubic feet per second. Flood flows larger than the improved channel capacity would result in the inundation of numerous commercial, industrial, and residential buildings and would have a widespread effect on industrial production. The largest probable flood on Onondaga Creek would affect real estate valued at more than \$100,000,000. The estimated damages for the 1920 flood were \$500,000 direct and \$1,000,000 indirect.

The possibility of the existing channel capacity being exceeded is great, the flood menace is serious, and the need is urgent for relief measures to prevent a disaster in the future. In view of the small existing channel and the threat to lives and social security of the people of this community, the Board concludes that the project is justified and that the United States is warranted in undertaking it, provided local interests furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of War that they will (a) provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way including all utility and

bridge changes; (b) hold and save the United States free from claims for damages due to the construction works; and (c) maintain and operate the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War.

Public Law 228 of the Seventy-seventh Congress authorized the Syracuse flood control project with many others.

The Army engineers have completed plans for the improvement and Governor Dewey, of New York, has made available the funds required for local contribution. It remains only for Congress to appropriate the funds authorized by an act of Congress which became a law on August 18, 1941.

Since I have been a Member of Congress, it has been a settled policy of Government to make appropriations to control floods and prevent the tremendous loss and destruction they cause. No project is authorized unless approved and found to be a profitable investment by that most efficient of Government agencies, the Army engineers, and by our able Committee on Flood Control.

The program was interrupted by the World War when men and materials were conscripted for the war effort. The war is over and the program should be resumed and spread over a period of years to provide a flow of employment, to conserve our rich natural resources of farm land which is being washed to the sea, and to protect life and property, both in our rural and urban areas.

Many will assail the amendment before us as a "pork barrel" measure. I trust the Army engineers and the Committee on Flood Control to see that there is no pork in this particular barrel and I know I cannot obtain any funds for the Syracuse project without voting for others. I have lived all my life in the city of Syracuse. I know the damage and distress the people of the city, the Onondaga Indians, and the farmers south of the city have suffered from the perennial floods of Onondaga Creek. That is why I am voting for this amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to passing the Snyder amendment, which calls for an additional expenditure of over \$2,000,000,000 during the next 6 years.

A great number of projects in this flood-control amendment are meritorious, but unfortunately a number of the projects included therein are without merit, and their purpose is merely to bring pork-barrel expenditures into certain areas of the country.

After the first of the year the committee can hold hearings and extend plenty of time to the proper consideration of a flood-control bill which will be practical and necessary for the different areas of the country benefited thereby.

I will heartily support and vote for all flood-control projects of merit which the committee will submit for the consideration of the Congress next year when due consideration can be given to the practicality and necessity of the various projects.

I propose to vote against the Snyder amendment.

Two amendments to the present deficiency appropriation bill should be adopted.

The Lanham amendment calling for an additional twenty-four million five hundred thousand to relieve the housing shortage for the returning veteran is vitally necessary.

I represent an industrial area into which thousands of war workers have moved during the last 5 years. When I was home 2 weeks ago, I met a great number of married war veterans, some of whom have families, who cannot find a house in which to live. As demobilization progresses during the coming months, this number of homeless war veterans will increase greatly in my district and will, no doubt, run into the millions when you consider the Nation as a whole.

I understand that there are over a million and a half married men now in the military service, and an equal number of single veterans will be married during the coming year. This will add a total of 3,000,000 homeless families to the already great number who cannot find dwellings.

I sympathize with the Appropriations Committee in every effort it is making toward economy, but reducing an appropriation which would deny thousands of our war heroes an opportunity to enjoy a peacetime home is false economy, and will break the morale of our returning servicemen and further cripple peacetime reconversion.

Another amendment to this bill which should be adopted unanimously is to increase the appropriations to provide sufficient hospitals to properly take care of our wounded and disabled veterans.

I have conferred with General Hines on several occasions before he resigned from the Veterans' Administration, and also with Gen. Omar Bradley, regarding the critical hospital situation in the industrial Calumet region and other parts of northern Indiana. Last spring, General Hines recommended to the Board of Hospitalization the erection of a veterans' hospital in the northern Indiana area. During the past year I have had a great number of complaints where our disabled veterans have been denied hospital space at Hines Hospital in Chicago, because of the fact that this facility is overtaxed in serving the city of Chicago and adjacent territory in the State of Illinois.

The Veterans' Administration officials have made a careful survey of this area and other parts of the Nation, and have already established their plans for expansion of their veterans' hospital program. This survey was made with the desire and knowledge that our Government must take care of its war heroes who have been physically incapacitated and are entitled to the best of hospital and medical care from a grateful Nation.

I believe this Congress has no alternative but to appropriate every dollar which is needed to carry out this sacred duty to the war veterans of World War II and World War I.

I voted for both of these amendments in the Committee of the Whole, and I hope that if a record vote is taken on these amendments before the final passage of this bill these amendments will be retained and adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment to include flood-control projects will be adopted. All these have been approved by Congress after exhaustive hearings before the Flood Control Committees of both Houses.

Floods are like fires. We hope they never will come but when they do so, they come without warning. The only kind of insurance or protection against floods is some type of flood protection. A flood control dam is like an army or a navy. We hope we will never need it but when we do we need it desperately.

In the list of proposed projects is one from my district, the Third District of California. That is the Folsom Dam. This project is on the American River and would protect Sacramento, the capital of California. Sacramento is located at the junction of the American and Sacramento Rivers. In times passed the city has been flooded. If a flood should come concurrently on these rivers the water would rush over the levees of the American and severely damage the city. The testimony was that some parts of the city might be 10 feet under water. The Folsom Dam would safeguard both the lives and the property of Sacramento and remove the annually threatening menace of a devastating flood.

Another project in my district is on the Littlejohn Creek. That project is not in the present amendment. It is called the Farmington Dam project. In the past the Littlejohn Creek and the Calaveras River have caused severe damage to property in Stockton and to surrounding farm lands. This project would remove this menace, which has resulted in so much property damage in the past.

These projects and many others like them should be built now as we never know when nature will go on a rampage and damage our people and their property.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Chairman, ordinarily I would not reply or disagree with the distinguished gentleman from my own State, the Honorable FREDERICK C. SMITH. No one has ever impugned the motives of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio with respect to his integrity and his charitable actions. Before entering Congress, as mayor of his city he not only declined to accept the salary of mayor but reached into his own pocket in order that his city might be taken out of the red and put into the black. He has always voted to save the financial resources of this Nation. No man in the House of Representatives has ever had more courage in directing the opinions of the Members of this House to the dangers of appropriations and appropriations than has Dr. SMITH. However, I am impelled to disagree with his remarks in this debate, especially in reference to the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable J. BUELL SNYDER.

This is not "pork barrel" legislation. For over 3 years I have been working in behalf of the distressed sufferers as a result of the floods which occurred along Lake Erie, and I refer specifically to the Howard Farms-Reno disaster. I did not offer a definite amendment today in re-

gard to the Howard Farms disaster inasmuch as assurance had been given me by not only the Army engineers, to whom I wish to express gratitude, and I further wish to express gratitude to the chairman of the Flood Control Committee, the Honorable WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON, of Mississippi. May I refer to the debates and remarks of Mr. WHITTINGTON and myself on page 4231 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 9, 1944. I wish to concur with the gentleman of Ohio today, the dean of our delegation, the Honorable THOMAS A. JENKINS, as to the integrity, industry, and uprightness of the Army engineers and express special appreciation for the thorough work of Colonel Goethals and the engineers under him. I wish to state here and now that the relief which is to be furnished the sufferers of the floods on the shore of Lake Erie can in no way be termed "pork barrel" and they are receiving no "bacon." What is to be done for the sufferers on the shores of Lake Erie is something long since overdue. Lakes may flood as well as rivers, contrary to the opinion of some of the officials in our Government. We of northern Ohio are never selfish and shall not endeavor to prevent the sufferers of any other portion of our great country from getting aid. The prevention of flood is not extravagance; it is economy. Had this House listened to our appeals in the first place in regard to the Howard Farms-Reno disaster, thousands of dollars would have been saved. I hate to quote maxims, but sometimes we need not so much be informed as to be reminded and in prevention of floods: "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure."

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ENGEL of Michigan) there were—ayes 137, noes 83.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will that allow the offering of amendments?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. It just waives the reading of the bill. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, here we are again at the political trough—"pork" to the tune of \$2,100,000,000 in the name of flood control.

As usual, the pork is so temptingly distributed and in such tremendous quantities throughout the congressional districts as to make it most difficult to successfully combat. The framers of the bill saw to it that a majority of Congressmen could, by supporting the measure, carry home some prime bacon for their districts—\$2,100,000,000 worth in all.

In all likelihood many of the constituents who will receive the bacon will be made enough happier to give their support to the reelection of the Congressmen concerned.

But, Mr. Chairman, ere long, at the rate the Congress has been going, the American people in general, along with those who are more directly concerned with the political pork that is involved in this bill in the name of flood control, will be confronted with another kind of flood. That one will make the Mississippi, Ohio, Missouri, Tennessee River Valley, and all the other river valley floods that have occurred in the past look like tiny innocent summer freshets.

Most of you know what that is. Surely most Congressmen cannot deny that we are haunted with a premonition that the unconscionable spending that we so recklessly continue to indulge in is causing an inundation of debt and monetary corruption that threatens to submerge completely what vestiges still remain of constitutional government and human liberty in this country.

Should this greatest and most terrible of all floods overtake us, it would be but natural for those who were responsible for the catastrophe to have their scapegoats. That might give us some consolation. But, Mr. Chairman, it will not in the least help any Congressman to save what property he possesses or to keep his children and their posterity from becoming slaves of the state, as now prevails in Russia and the other countries which suffered this fate.

Are we so naive as to believe that we can go through this wild and dissolute spending until bankruptcy overtakes the Nation and still somehow be able to save our property and values from the same fate that these have always suffered under similar circumstances, namely, confiscation by the state?

Do not believe it.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in my 15 years as a Member of this House, this is my first time to appear for the purpose of responding to the remarks of one of my colleagues. When the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH], who has just addressed the committee, opened his speech he was reading from a manuscript, which indicated it had been prepared in advance. I would not have appeared here at this time had there not been so many references to so many Members of this House as "pork gatherers," and so forth, as the gentleman made in his remarks, that I regard as entirely unworthy of a Member of this House. I am a poor man myself, and I buy and pay for all the pork that I eat. But I have read in a book somewhere where the most upright man who ever walked upon the face of the earth, when the Pharisees were accusing a lone woman of adultery, stooped down and wrote in the dust, "Let him who is without sin cast the first stone," and the cowardly accusers fled.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. Will the gentleman challenge the gentleman from Ohio to



tell the House one authorization bill embodied in the Snyder amendment that the gentleman from Ohio voted against?

Mr. MAY. I do not think I should challenge him to do that, because he has made a challenge that he ought to withdraw and strike from the Record. What I would like to say is this: I have stood for economy since I have been in this House, but if we had followed the leadership of the gentleman from Ohio and others who think like he does we would never have built the Panama Canal, we would never have constructed the great Boulder Dam, we would never have won the great war through which we have just passed. There are many lasting, valuable improvements all over this country that would not today be in existence.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. And we never would have had the WPA.

Mr. MAY. That is right. But we never would have had a great many other things that we should have had. But here is a widespread flood-control program that has been recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, recommended by the Corps of Engineers, recommended and endorsed by the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, with the exception of a single vote, and yet men who support that committee and its views are charged by the gentleman from Ohio with infidelity and pork gathering on the floor of the House at this time. I do not know how the gentleman from Ohio feels about what he has just said, but if and when the time ever comes that I shall do such a thing, I will resign and go home.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, why should I ask for this time? I am taking it because I should probably feel a little guilty. I voted for the Snyder amendment. But my record seems to have been in the years past rather consistent for economy. I did talk much the last 10 years against the great spending program. Picture these two Democratic leaders pleading today for economy. I cannot recognize them in that role. Why, they spread so much money over the country in the last 10 years that one great Democratic Senator declared that they bought two elections. Now certainly we should practice economy, and I might possibly question my vote. I thought yesterday I would support the Committee on Appropriations in full measure. However I voted for the amendment. My friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], whom I expected to follow, told me that it shows my versatility. I accept the pleasant rebuke. I realize what it means to puff against the wind when I was pleading for economy. Yesterday I listened to most of the speeches, and I was somewhat amused, and after reading the Record carefully, I finally decided I could and should vote the much-discussed so-called flood-control amendment. There is not a bit of "pork" in it for my district, I can say to my friend

the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH]. He knows how greatly I appreciate his thoughtful consideration of financial matters, and that I often sympathize and agree with him, but he rather needed me on that vote. There was no "bacon" in it for me, so I feel I can speak freely. Those leaders told us to worry about the debt. Why, I have worried about it for a long time. Seemingly more debt we have the more prosperous we are. Every other nation seems to think so.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Is that the only authority the gentleman has to state his position on that?

Mr. GIFFORD. Well, on this currency question, one good old Democrat once said on the floor here, "We Democrats never could understand the currency question, and sometimes we think you damn Republicans do not understand it." Surely we do not understand the currency question. Having been on the Committee on Banking and Currency for so long and having listened to so many experts, I find that even those experts do not know much of anything about money. It is a psychological situation, is it not? As long as you have confidence in our printed pledges, all may be well.

Somebody said here yesterday something about what would happen if bonds went down 5 points. Why, it seems that they cannot go down. You legislated their redemption at par value. The bonds would seem to be protected at full value in printed money. They will be taken up by the Federal Reserve banks at par. The printed money used to redeem them may not be regarded as being too safe and might hasten inflation. I tell my banks, "Do not worry about the bonds. You can receive par value and return the dollars to your depositors."

Why are people not buying bonds quite so fast as they formerly were, as was claimed yesterday? Day before yesterday a lady said to me, "I will not buy any more bonds. I see such awful waste by the military and Federal agencies."

Is it not a safe investment? We buy the bonds, do we not, knowing they are perfectly safe because we tax ourselves to pay ourselves for them. Is that not wonderful finance? But it is not fully understood. So many people think they will escape and the other fellow will pay the tax. They will not escape. There is no other way to pay the debt except to tax ourselves to pay ourselves. But the recent doctrine is, "What of it? Do we not owe it to ourselves?" Of course, there are other ways of wiping out a public debt, as taught us by many other nations. We have already used the devaluation process.

I felt I wanted to support you, Mr. MANSFIELD, for the hard work you have done. You are careful to make no unsound recommendation in river and harbor matters. I have so often appeared before your committee. The committee seems to have turned you down flatly. I do not like it. Again I do not get any bacon in this legislation. After these many years I confess I cannot claim too

much knowledge of the effect of printed money or the currency question. I know I do not know, and that is more than a lot of people know.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, so many have evidenced an interest in H. R. 4779 introduced by the gentleman from Illinois, Hon. CHAUNCEY W. REED, that I think it best to make this statement.

The subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives will begin hearings on this bill on Friday, December 7, at 10 a. m.

If the bill is to accomplish its purpose as announced by its author, of safeguarding the interests of the stockholders and junior security holders of railroads in reorganization, it must have prompt action. Several pending reorganizations are in that critical stage where to delay would be to deny action and would render it impossible for the Congress to aid any of the thousands of small investors whose savings were invested in good faith in such securities.

It would be a grave national calamity for railroad credit to be killed. Your Committee on the Judiciary has done its best to safeguard railroad credit by seeking to protect the investing public who have heretofore been the purchasers of stocks and junior securities. Those who are wise enough to take no chances and are therefore the holders of senior securities, secured by gilt-edged mortgages, are already adequately protected.

We are distressed that thousands of those who are not adequately protected should be wiped out without giving them a run for their money. So, if there be any way to ascertain the facts and to demonstrate, by the testimony of those experts who are in a position to know, how the structure of legitimate railroad credit may be protected and maintained, this desirable result should be accomplished without delay.

The committee, of course, has given no study to this new bill, very recently introduced by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] but we hope that full and fair hearings on his bill may result in sound legislation for the common good of all those interested in American railroads.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMASON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations

to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Snyder amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Rankin amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: On page 17, after line 8, add a new paragraph to read as follows:

"For construction of hospitals and domiciliary facilities for fiscal year 1946, \$158,320,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment upon which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SNYDER: On page 43, after line 2, insert the following:

#### "RIVERS AND HARBORS

"For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for 'Rivers and Harbors,' including the objects specified under this head in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1946, \$25,516,000, to remain available until expended.

#### "FLOOD CONTROL

"Flood control, general: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for 'Flood control, general,' including the objects specified under this head in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1946, \$81,759,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for constructing the Garrison (N. Dak.) Reservoir beyond dimensions which would provide for a higher pool elevation than 1,830 feet or for constructing dikes or levees which would provide for a higher pool elevation than 1,830 feet for operating such dam.

"For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for 'Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries,' including the objects specified under this head in the War Department Civil Appropriations Act, 1946, \$15,000,000, to remain available until expended."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 168, nays 53.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The count discloses that 221 Members are present; a quorum. So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include some statements and letters concerning the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Mr. CRAVENS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the Fort Smith Times-Record.

#### DISCONTINUANCE OF LAND-GRANT RATES FOR TRANSPORTATION OF GOVERNMENT TRAFFIC

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 694) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 694) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 2.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 2. The amendment made by section 1 of this Act shall take effect October 1, 1946: *Provided, however*, That any travel or transportation specifically contracted for prior to such effective date shall be paid for at the rate, fare, or charge in effect at the time of entering into such contract of carriage or shipment."

And the Senate agree to the same.

LYLE H. BOREN,  
J. PERCY PRIEST,  
OREN HARRIS,  
PEHR G. HOLMES,  
CARROLL REECE,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

E. C. JOHNSON,  
BURTON K. WHEELER,  
E. H. MOORE,  
CLYDE M. REED,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 694) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate made two amendments to the bill as it passed the House.

Amendment No. 1: Section 2 of the House bill provided that the amendment to existing law made by section 1 of the bill should take effect 90 days after the date of enactment of the bill. The amendment of the Senate struck out this section and substituted the following:

"Sec. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall take effect October 1, 1946: *Provided, however*, That any travel or transportation contracted for prior to such effective date shall be paid for at the rate, fare, or charge in effect at the time of entering into such contract."

The substitute amendment agreed to in conference is the same as the Senate amendment, except that the words "section 1 of" are inserted before the words "this Act", and clarifying changes have been made in the proviso without changing its intended meaning.

Amendment No. 2: This amendment of the Senate added a new section 4 to the bill, providing for making funds available for expenditure, for the benefit of veterans, in establishing family-type farms. The Senate has receded on this amendment.

LYLE H. BOREN,  
J. PERCY PRIEST,  
OREN HARRIS,  
PEHR G. HOLMES,  
CARROLL REECE,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, the conference report now before the House is on the bill generally known as the land-grant bill. This bill passed the House twice by overwhelming votes, on one occasion by 236 to 16 and another time by an even larger majority. When the conferees met to consider the Senate version of the bill we found they had put in amendments which a great many Members of the House felt, regardless of their merits, were not properly a part of this question and we brought the conference report back to the House with the result that the House rejected it. Today, however, we have brought in a conference report making the bill identical with the bill that has twice passed the House by overwhelming vote.

I want the membership clearly to understand that the conference report here before us makes the bill identical with the one they have overwhelmingly approved twice with the one exception that whereas the effective date of the act under the House bill was 90 days from the enactment of the bill, the conferees made the effective date October 1, 1946. So the only difference between the House version of the bill and what we have before us at the present time is the extension of the effective date of the act.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.



Mr. HOBBS. Do I understand correctly that the bill incorporates the amendment I offered and which the gentleman accepted?

Mr. BOREN. It does; it still carries the gentleman's provision. As I say, the only change at all is the striking out of the 90 days' clause and inserting in lieu thereof October 1, 1940.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman explain to the House the effect of this change of effective date agreed upon by the conferees?

Mr. BOREN. There was a feeling on the part of many in the House and Senate that railroad traffic was so abnormal in wartime that the 90-day effective date might be more costly to the Government and result in unusual benefit to certain railroads. Therefore, we moved the date ahead so there could be no question but what the period of inflated wartime travel and use would be over, plus a reasonable time for readjustment and reorganization.

I wish to remind the House, Mr. Speaker, that in the Seventy-eighth Congress, on May 23, 1944, this bill in its present form passed the House by a vote of 236 to 16. Again, on May 4, 1945, the present bill was adopted after extended debate by a vote of something like 5 to 1. Your conferees have brought back to you the bill in exactly the form it was when it left the House, with this one exception of the effective date. We felt, after the last action of the House on the matter, that that was our responsibility, and we were successful in doing it. The conference report is unanimous. The bill originally came from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with a unanimous vote, with one exception, last spring. I see no need for further discussion at this time unless there are questions or points at issue; I see no reason to rehash all the arguments that have already been presented to you.

I realize, of course, there are a few Members who are opposed to the bill, and who have consistently been opposed to the bill. I propose shortly to recognize my colleague the gentleman from Missouri, who I know wants to speak in opposition to this bill. There are some Members, as I say, who have constantly opposed the principle of the bill, as indicated by the fact that there were 16 votes against it. I am absolutely certain that any Member of this House who sat on the committee and studied this subject, as was evidenced by the vote of 25 to 1 on the reporting of the bill from the committee, will approve this bill all the way through.

I find no fault with my good friend from St. Louis and others who, I know, have taken a constant position of opposition to this subject; but I feel that any Member who has made a close study of this matter and has had contact with it and who understands all the effects involved in this bill would get a clear and fair comprehension of it and approve the bill, as has been indicated by the House.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. As a matter of fact, the only issue before us now is whether or not we are in favor of making the change that has been suggested? The merits and demerits of the bill have already been decided by both the House and Senate?

Mr. BOREN. The gentleman from Texas has well stated the issue. There is one question before the House today and that is whether or not you are going to reaffirm the position that the House has already taken. There is only one issue involved and that is whether you would rather have it as the House passed it, that is, go into effect in 90 days or go into effect on next October 1.

We felt this was a reasonable concession to make to iron out the differences between the House and the Senate.

I am asking the House to approve a conference report on H. R. 694, this being a bill to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940. Under this section of the 1940 act, which the bill now before the House undertakes to amend, the Government pays on all of its civilian freight the usual commercial rates. It is provided, however, in the 1940 act that the land-grant railroads, so-called, shall give the Government half rates on military and naval traffic moving for military and naval and not for civilian use. The bill now before the House amends the 1940 act by providing that the Government shall pay, on and after October 1, 1946, full commercial rates on all of the freight owned by the Government, whether it be military or civilian.

I should like to remind the House that the bill deals with the so-called land-grant railroads and railroads that, by reason of equalization agreements, have agreed to meet the land-grant rates. Back in the fifties and sixties, in order to encourage the construction of railroads into the unsettled western territory and to a certain degree into southern territory, the Government granted to certain railroads about 130,000,000 acres of public land, worth, at the time, according to Mr. Eastman, 97 cents an acre. It was provided in the various acts granting these lands that Government-owned freight should be moved free of tolls. The Supreme Court of the United States and the Court of Claims, as the result of a lengthy litigation, decided that the proper construction of these clauses of the granting acts was that the Government freight should move at half price. Following these decisions of the Courts, Congress, at various times, passed laws which fixed the rate to be paid by the Government on land-grant roads at 50 percent of the commercial rate.

There are approximately 230,000 miles of railroad in the United States. Of this amount, about 14,000 miles are so-called land-grant roads, meaning thereby railroads which were granted lands in aid of construction. Most of this mileage is west of the Mississippi River, although a considerable amount lies in southern territory, south of the Potomac and east of the Mississippi. Many railroads that compete directly with so-called land-grant roads have entered into equaliza-

tion agreements, under which the non-land-grant roads agree to meet the rates of the land-grant roads applicable on Government traffic. However, in all of that section of the country north of the Potomac and east of the Mississippi, where there is very little land-grant mileage, the railroads do not grant special land-grant rates on Government traffic.

For a long time, the shippers of the country have been urging the repeal of these land-grant statutes. The reason why shippers object is because of the inequalities and discriminations that result from the application of the rates. Obviously, a shipper located on a land-grant line or an equalization line selling its manufactured product to the Government has a tremendous advantage over a shipper not so located as to be able to take advantage of the land-grant rates. Furthermore, to calculate the exact rate applicable in every case is a very complicated process and shippers are often perplexed to know just what the rates really are, whether paid by themselves or paid by their competitors. By reason of the injustice and inequalities resulting from the application of these rates, the shippers of the country, with practical unanimity, have long urged Congress to repeal the land-grant statutes. The National Industrial Traffic League, which represents the most important shippers of the country, and the shippers' advisory boards, Nation-wide in scope, are unanimous in their request for the repeal of these statutes.

The National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners is in favor of the repeal. The Interstate Commerce Commission has many times pointed out to Congress how difficult it is to regulate the rates of the railroads intelligently, as long as these special rates are in effect. The Office of Defense Transportation is of the same opinion. All of the railroad labor unions have urged Congress to relieve the situation by repealing these statutes.

The matter has been before Congress many times and hearings have been held both in the House and Senate at which all interests have been heard at length. I remind the House that in the Seventy-eighth Congress, on May 23, 1944, a bill almost identical with the one now under consideration passed the House by a vote of 236 to 16. That was H. R. 4184 of the Seventy-eighth Congress and came before the House as the result of a report by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which report was unanimous or nearly so. Again in the present Congress, on May 4, 1945, the present bill was adopted, after extended debate, by a vote of 176 to 40. As the bill passed the House, it provided that the repeal should be effective 90 days after the date of the enactment of the act.

When the bill reached the Senate, it was referred to the appropriate committee, namely the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and that committee, on July 28, 1945, reported the bill favorably, with an amendment which made the act effective 90 days after the date of the cessation of hostilities in the war with Japan, as proclaimed by the President or declared by concurrent resolution of the two Houses, whichever was the earlier.

The bill came before the Senate on October 2, 1945, and was extensively debated for several days. Ultimately, the Senate amended the bill by making the effective date of the repeal October 1, 1946.

The Senate also adopted an amendment, commonly referred to as the McFarland amendment, which proposed to create a veterans' fund amounting to \$68,272,770 to be used for assisting eligible veterans in certain States to establish themselves upon farm lands and to be used in part of reclamation and irrigation projects in those named States.

By reason of the amendments adopted by the Senate, it was necessary to send the bill to conference. Conferees were appointed and a conference report brought to the House and considered by this body on October 29. In the first conference report, the Senate amendments were adopted, these being the one fixing the effective date as October 1, 1946, and the other the McFarland amendment. Otherwise, the bill remained practically unchanged. The conference report was debated in the House on October 29, and the House voted on a roll call, by a vote of 167 to 114, not to approve the conference report.

Thereupon, the House asked for a further conference, to which the Senate agreed. The second conference report is the one now before the House. It has already been adopted by the Senate. This report eliminates the McFarland amendment entirely and provides that the repeal shall be effective on October 1, 1946. It is this report which I am asking the House to approve.

I should like to emphasize certain features of the bill. In paragraph (a) of the amended section 321, it is expressly provided that section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act is not in any way repealed, amended, or affected. Under this section 22, which has been used a great deal during the war period and, in fact, prior thereto, the railroads are permitted to make special rates for the handling of Government property, without reference to the commercial rates. The hearings on this bill, which have been numerous and voluminous, indicate that under this section 22, which will remain in the law, hundreds of special rates have been made for the Government, when emergencies made such action necessary.

Another feature of the law which should be mentioned is that the repeal does not take effect until October 1, 1946. By that time obviously, practically all of the Government transportation having to do with war will have been completed. The problem of returning the soldiers to their homes will certainly be finished before that time. The movement of war material incident to reconversion and the transition from war to peace will end well before October 1, 1946. It cannot be said, therefore, that the war effort will in any way be hampered or handicapped by the repeal of these special rates.

Something has been said from time to time to the effect that if this bill becomes a law, the railroads will profit, at the expense of the Government, in an amount estimated to be \$200,000,000 a

year. But this figure was an estimate based on the movement of men and materials when the war effort was at the maximum. It should be remembered that by the Transportation Act of 1940 the railroads were relieved from the obligation to make special rates on civilian goods. From and after October 1, 1946, the movement of military and naval material and of troops of the United States will be comparatively small.

The testimony on this bill shows that prior to 1939, when we began our preparation for war, the Government deductions never amounted to more than \$7,000,000 a year. This was at a time, too, when under the law deductions were allowed on civilian goods. The Board of Investigation and Research estimated that from the beginning of the history of land-grant deductions up to and including December 31, 1937, the deductions amounted to about \$56,000,000. It appeared, therefore, that in normal times \$56,000,000 represented the deductions in a period of approximately 50 years.

No one can say with certainty just how much these deductions would amount to, limited as they are to military and naval traffic, but it is safe to say, upon the most conservative estimate, that they would not amount to more than \$5,000,000 a year, from and after October 1, 1946, a date when the experts in the Army and Navy estimate that the war movement will be completed.

To summarize the situation: We have a bill here which has twice been overwhelmingly passed by the House and passed by the Senate without a roll call. The railroads did receive 130,000,000 acres of land, worth at the time of the grant about \$126,000,000. By reason of the extensive shipment of war material in the late war, they have repaid, according to the record, probably \$1,000,000,000 to the Government. The shippers of the country are unanimously in favor of the repeal, as are all the regulating agencies, Federal and State. The present act provides that the Interstate Commerce Commission shall take into consideration in fixing rates any benefit which the railroads receive from this bill. No measure has ever been before Congress which has been more extensively debated or more generally approved by the country.

It has been said that this is a railroad bill. As a matter of fact, it is a shippers' bill. Undoubtedly the railroads favor the repeal of these rates. It will mean something to them in the way of increased revenues.

The principal advantage to the railroads, however, is in removing the uncertainty as to the traffic to which the rates apply. Under the 1940 act, land-grant rates apply only to military and naval property moving for military and naval use. Controversies have sprung up all over the country as to the proper classification of particular shipments. Suits are pending in the courts to determine whether lend-lease material is or is not subject to land-grant rates. There is a case now pending in the Circuit Court of Appeals of the Fourth Circuit which involves the question of whether fertilizer being shipped to Great Britain

during the war is entitled to land-grant rates or, in other words, whether this fertilizer is military or naval property. It is contended by the Government that all lend-lease shipments, being in a broad general sense in aid of the war effort, fall within the description of military property. Numerous controversies of this kind exist and the railroads would naturally like to have the question put at rest.

The chief demand for this repeal comes, however, from shippers who have been perplexed and bothered for many years as to the application of these rates and have been greatly annoyed at the discriminations that result from the fact that one manufacturer has an advantage over another by reason of his fortuitous location upon a land-grant line. In making bids for Government traffic, those who are not located on land-grant lines are at a distinct disadvantage.

The talk about the railroads receiving a benefit of \$200,000,000 a year utterly ignores the fact that the repeal does not become effective until October 1, 1946.

The best authorities in the Government believe that the movement of war material and troops will be over before that time. Under the 1940 act, land-grant rates are not applicable to civilian goods. The movement of war material and troops after October 1, 1946, will be only such as normally takes place in time of peace. Experience indicates that very likely the Government deductions would amount to no more than \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000 a year.

We should not lose sight of the fact that the regulating authorities, namely, the Interstate Commerce Commission and the State commissions, all unanimously and enthusiastically advocate the repeal of these land grants. The Interstate Commerce Commission has pointed out that it cannot properly regulate rates in land-grant territory as long as these abnormal Government rates are in effect.

There is no reason why the Government should have any preference in the shipment of ordinary freight. Particularly is there no reason why one section of the country should be given these special rates which are denied in another section of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and at this time I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I opposed this legislation before the gentleman from Oklahoma was ever a Member of this House. I have opposed it from the outset ever since it was first suggested.

It is true this bill passed the House on two occasions; unfortunately, I was unable to be here at that time. It is likewise true, however, it has been defeated on several occasions.

This House voted down a conference report on this bill just a few weeks ago. The gentleman from Oklahoma admitted a minute ago that abnormal times existed during the period of a war. That is the best argument that can be made for voting down the pending conference report.

The proponents say the only issue is whether or not the House wants to stand by the action it has previously taken.



The fact that the House made a mistake before does not by any means warrant the House in making another mistake.

Here is the issue confronting the House now: It is whether or not you are going to make the taxpayers of this country pay three or four hundred million dollars a year more than they have been paying to move our armed forces and military property over land-grant roads, and in fact other roads, that have made an agreement with the Government to carry its soldiers and military property at land-grant rates. Fighting has stopped but millions of those in our armed forces must be brought home as well as military material.

Mr. Speaker, many, many years ago the Government gave 130,000,000 acres of land away and it gave that land away for the purpose of building railroads. In return for that concession, it was agreed that the railroads would carry our soldiers and Government property free of charge. Remember that phrase "free of charge." That was the agreement that was made for the 130,000,000 acres that the Government gave away and, may I say, that 130,000,000 acres of ground covered a larger area than some of our States.

In later years the railroads told the courts that the agreement they made was that the railroads would be available to the Government to carry its soldiers and property insisting the railroads did not agree to do it, but said the right-of-way would be available for the Government to do it. The railroads won their case. So, rather than go into the railroad business, the Government made an agreement with the railroads that they should carry our soldiers, sailors, and our military property at 50 percent of the commercial rate. That has been going on for years. The railroads come in now and want us to abrogate that agreement. They want the Government to pay 100-percent commercial rates for moving our armed forces and our property. Can anyone say that so far as the movement of our troops and our military property are concerned that this war is over? We have millions of men in Europe and Pacific area waiting to come back home. There is no telling how many millions of tons of property we have which must be brought back home.

Now there is another feature to this. This does not only apply to land-grant roads. Other railroads not land-grant roads went before the Interstate Commerce Commission and secured permission from the Commission to apply to the Government to carry its troops and property on a 50-percent basis or on a land-grant rate. That is known as the equalization rate. That is in effect on non-land-grant roads today. Remember that. The minute that you repeal the land-grant rates then the agreements of the other carriers, non-land-grant roads, with the Government are canceled. So you not only lose the benefit of the land-grant rates from the land-grant roads, but you lose the benefits that are coming to this Government from roads that are not land-grant roads. They want the business. It is

profitable at the land-grant rate or they would not have applied for it.

I want to say that my basis for the figure that I gave a few minutes ago is the statement made before the subcommittee on War Department Appropriations by the Chief of Transportation Division of the War Department. "You repeal the land-grant rates and then we will want \$225,000,000 more to carry our soldiers and our property." I defy anybody to deny that statement.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. However, the gentleman will state, as a part of the record, that that was during the peak of war transportation when the War Department gave that estimate.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is true, but I maintain the war is not over as far as the movement of our armed forces and property is concerned. It will not be over until our boys and our property are brought home. That \$225,000,000, I will remind you, applies only to the War Department. How much more will the Navy and the Maritime Commission need?

There is another matter that enters into this, that you want to give a little thought to, and that is that the railroads have taken the position that they do not have to apply land-grant rates to the shipment of lend-lease products. That case is in the courts, and if the railroads win that case they are going to receive hundreds of millions of dollars more in freight rates for all the land-lease shipments they handled at land-grant rates.

Now look at this question this way. Hundreds of millions of dollars are involved. It is going to mean that forevermore we are going to be required to pay the full commercial rate. What do the railroads offer the Government in return for the Congress abrogating that solemn agreement that was made? Do they agree to reduce the rates so that the shippers will get the benefit? Absolutely no. Do they agree to increase the wages of the railroad employees, including those white-collared workers in the offices that have never been treated right by the railroads? Absolutely no. They offer nothing. Every dollar will go into the treasury of the railroads.

You heard the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], yesterday and you heard the ranking member, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOOLRUM], tell you about the financial condition of this country. Do we want today to place another burden of hundreds of millions of dollars on the people of this country? That is just exactly what you are going to do today if you approve this conference report.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman know that the bonds of the Northern Pacific Railroad Co., the greatest beneficiary of this public-land grant, are way below par, and that the company never

paid a dividend until the war came on? The gentleman talks about all the money pouring into the hands of the barons.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the Northern Pacific were properly handled those bonds would not be below par. The gentleman well knows how the railroad barons milked the Northern Pacific.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the gentleman. He has been very kind.

This is no little matter but one that deserves real consideration on the part of the Members of this House.

We have been petitioned by the railroads and we have been petitioned by the railroad lobbyists to support this bill, but there is another type of people in this country, the ones who elected you and me to office, the masses of the people, who are not organized, who are going to have to pay this bill, who feel that we as their representatives are going to protect their interests in this House. They are the ones I am going to vote for today, I repeat the ones that will have to pay this bill if you agree to this conference report.

You were fighting here a few hours ago on less than \$100,000,000, but here you are voting to put on the taxpayers a burden of several hundred million dollars, and forevermore make this Government pay the full commercial rate for the handling of its troops and its military properties. What are the railroads going to do in the future for the 130,000,000 acres of land they received? Absolutely nothing.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman referred to the fact that this would involve hundreds of millions of dollars a year for the Government. I call his attention to the fact that the Board of Investigation and Research, having studied this problem, reported that the total amount saved to the Government from 1928 to 1940, 12 years, was \$85,000,000, which is \$7,000,000 per year and not the hundreds of millions of dollars about which the gentleman is talking.

Mr. COCHRAN. I put a letter in the Record from the Comptroller General the other day that shows exactly what the Government has been paying to the land-grant roads and to those roads that are charging the equalization rates. Among other statements he said, We paid the railroads over \$5,000,000,000 in freight in 1 year during the period of this war.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman knows these boys are going to be back by next October; I hope so.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not know that. I wish I did know. Nor does the gentleman from Indiana know they are going to be back here by next October but I hope and pray they will be.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] such time as he may desire.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, this matter has been fully thrashed out by the House. I have no feeling that there is a necessity that we should rehash the matter. I simply want to call the attention of the House again to the fact that the railroads have returned to the Government in the form of reduced rates over \$1,000,000,000. The original total valuation of all the land given to the railroads was less than \$130,000,000.

The great outstanding purpose of the Government land grants was to develop the central, western, and southwestern sections of the country by making them accessible. That purpose was accomplished. Reduced rates to Government was not of any great consequence when the grants were made. In my judgment, the just claims of the Government have been more than repaid.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. By no stretch of the imagination could it have been contemplated at the time these land-grant rate transactions were made that the Government would go into the wholesale business of developing hydroelectric projects all over the country and that the railroads would be called upon to haul cement and other supplies and materials across the United States to build that kind of plants.

Mr. LEA. The gentleman's statement is absolutely true. There were very few cases in which the original grant required the railroad to give free transportation. This 50-percent concession to the Government was made by the Congress and not in the original grant. The original grant provided for the use of the roadbed by the Government on the assumption that the Government would run its own trains. The Government has not done that. This 50-percent provision originated in lieu of the original concessions by an act of Congress.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. As I see the situation, it is not a question of whether or not the Government is making money out of this proposition. It is a question as to whether or not it is right.

Mr. LEA. Yes; that is the question. We cannot afford to refuse to satisfy our just obligations because it costs us something to do it. That is no argument. It would be a pitiful time for the Congress if a question like this cannot be considered on its merits. It is easy to demagog on questions like this, but here the question is one of distinguishing between what is just and what is unjust. This legislation is fair and right.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

(Mr. O'HARA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include two newspaper articles.)

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from California, the distinguished chairman of the committee, did not mean to indicate that anyone who opposes this bill is demagoging. I think somebody has to speak for the sort of ordinary folks that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], spoke about, because the other side of this matter has been very well presented here in Congress through the lobbying efforts in the interest of the great railroad systems of this country. I think we get down to the simple proposition of whether the House desires to pass upon this as a matter of finality. If you approve this conference report today, you permit the land-grant railroads to back out of the agreement which they solemnly made many years ago to carry free of charge the Government freight which was shipped by the railroads. In 1940, the railroads asked and the Congress agreed to cut that down to 50 percent. Since 1942, I think this bill has bobbed up here in Congress about three times. In 1942, it was overwhelmingly defeated. As the gentleman from Oklahoma says, it has been passed on a couple of occasions.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman does not mean that the 50-percent rate has been in effect only since 1940?

Mr. O'HARA. That is what I mean.

Mr. HINSHAW. Oh, no, it has been in effect a long time before that.

Mr. O'HARA. I think you will find it was not authorized by the Congress until 1940.

In any event, after getting out of 50 percent of their agreement it was not very long until they were asking to back out of 100 percent of their agreement.

Now, for the benefit of the gentlemen who are so sure that all the boys are going to be home by October 1, 1946, may I read something that has a bearing on this question. This apparently comes from the publicity department of the great Pennsylvania Railroad. It is from the Washington Star of last night. The article says:

"Military movements on the Pennsylvania Railroad are heavier now than at any previous time," C. R. Mathews, Jr., traffic manager, said today. "In the week ending November 10, military travel on the railroads reached an all-time high of 169,687 persons."

The distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] made an appeal to the great liberal element on my right, to the Members on his side of the aisle, in behalf of the common people. I would like to speak to my conservative friends on the left. They have been talking a great deal during the last few weeks on the matter of cutting down appropriations and cutting down expenses. Where is the logic if we pass a law which gives to the railroads of this country billions of dollars within the next few years? If we should get into another war, I do not know how many billions it will cost this country to transport Government property.

I appreciate the fact that many Members think this is not of such great moment, but I think if we are going to

speak in terms of billions of dollars—and I claim that is what it is going to cost the Government, and that means the taxpayers—I will state frankly to you, you are not going to have them home under the terms of this bill by October 1, 1946.

I will admit this amendment is an improvement on the bill which the House passed, but I certainly do not admit that under this amendment the great Government traffic is going to be dispensed with by October 1, 1946.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] has expired.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Can the gentleman from Minnesota tell me whether or not the financial condition of the railroads today warrant any such measure as this? If not, how can any of us be justified in voting for this measure which will cost our Treasury so many millions of dollars?

Mr. O'HARA. I know that I placed in the RECORD during the general debate upon this bill when it was before the House a statement showing the net earnings of the Class I railroads of the country. That statement showed that they had net earnings of several billion dollars, after taxes were paid, at that particular time. I do not recall the exact figure.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Does the gentleman recall that before the war one-third of the railroad mileage was in receivership, and another one-third was insolvent?

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman will be able to get time to discuss this matter. He is very much in favor of the bill, and I am sure he can get all the time he wants. Some of the railroads were in receivership. If we would look into the banking end of the railroads and some of the watered stock of some of the railroads, we would be doing the country a great deal more good than by passing this type of legislation.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, as to the railroads in receivership, the courts of the United States were looking into the matter about which the gentleman is speaking.

Mr. O'HARA. They had better do a little better job than has been done.

Mr. HALLECK. To my mind, the gentleman's answer is begging the question.

Mr. O'HARA. I am glad the gentleman brought this matter up, because I had overlooked it. In this morning's Post I noticed an item of news which shows what we are facing. The Investment Bankers' Association held a convention in Chicago. The only news item that came out of that convention is this, and I will insert the entire article in the RECORD, but this was the nub of the matter:



The evidence is convincing that a freight-rate increase is an absolute necessity if adequate railroad earning power is to be maintained.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. No. The gentleman can get some time. I would like to speak a little on this matter myself. I do not wish to be discourteous, but I do not want the gentleman to take up all of my time.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. No. I would like to finish my statement, and then I will yield to both of my distinguished friends.

I want to say to the membership, Mr. Speaker, that we are facing the proposition of giving to the railroads of the country out of the taxpayers' pockets, if you please, billions of dollars, that is only for the benefit of the railroads. The shippers and passengers who travel on these railroads can get no consideration in the way of benefits in freight or passenger-rate benefits, which we are giving the railroads under this bill. Then to have the investment bankers come in shouting for increase in rates makes one ask: Just where are the people of the country reaping any benefit from this type of legislation? Is this a case of the special pleader and the special interest getting consideration and the people of the country not getting the benefit they should have?

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. With the gentleman's permission, I should like first to yield to my distinguished friend from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I merely wanted to ask my friend: Is it not true that there is only one thing to be decided, whether or not you want this to take effect 90 days after the passage of the act or on October 1, 1946? That is all there is to it.

Mr. O'HARA. No, no; I may say to the gentleman that is not the question. The question is whether we vote this up or down. I want to see this report defeated.

Mr. BULWINKLE. If it is voted down that would be the question would it not?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me I insert at this point the two newspaper items to which I referred:

[From the Washington Evening Star of November 27, 1945]

#### MOVEMENT OF MILITARY ON PENNSY SETS RECORD

Military movements on the Pennsylvania Railroad are heavier now than at any previous time, C. H. Mathews, Jr., passenger traffic manager, said today.

In the week ended November 10 military travel on the railroad reached an all-time high of 169,687 persons.

Half the railroad's coaches are constantly in military service, he said, traveling great distances beyond the Pennsylvania's own territory. Approximately 65 percent of all pullmans in operation are assigned exclusively to military use, he added.

Military travel figures, Mr. Mathews said, have been climbing since August, contrary to popular conception of the situation.

[From the Washington Post of November 29, 1945]

#### IBA HOLDS RAISE IN RAIL FREIGHT RATES ESSENTIAL

CHICAGO, November 28.—The Investment Bankers Association went on record today in favor of freight-rate increases to maintain "adequate railroad earning power."

"The evidence is convincing that a freight rate increase is an absolute necessity if adequate railroad earning power is to be maintained. The only uncertainty is the size of the required increase," declared a committee report adopted by the association's thirty-fourth annual convention.

The report, signed by Fairman B. Dick, New York, chairman of the IBA railroad securities committee, said specific recommendations as to the size of a rate rise "are impossible without more definite knowledge as to future labor and materials costs."

Charles S. Garland, Baltimore, was elected president at the closing session. Vice Presidents named were Hazen S. Arnold, Toledo, Ohio; Julien H. Collins, Chicago, Ill.; H. De-war, San Antonio, Tex.; Edward Hopkinson, Jr., Philadelphia, and Lee M. Limbert, New York.

C. B. Merrill of Cleveland was elected to the board of governors.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE].

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Oklahoma said a few minutes ago, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce considered this question, had extended hearings and came to a conclusion supported by 25 to 1 that this legislation should be favorably considered by the House. The Committee so reported.

A great deal has been said about the common man in connection with this legislation. Let us see who is supporting this proposal. Not only the railroads, but the shippers' organization, and the railroad labor organization. These two organizations certainly represent the people. Every interest connected with the transportation industry, both carriers and labor, is in favor of the enactment of this legislation. I believe it is unfortunate, if I may be pardoned for saying so, that after 3 years of consideration, the results of which are being presented to the Membership of the House, for the House to fail to adopt the conference report.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I wish to inquire if this bill is not in the interest of the average shipper of the country?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Undoubtedly it is in the interest of the average shipper; and let me state further that the Interstate Commerce Commission approved this legislation. Former Director of Defense Transportation Joseph Eastman approved the legislation. The present Director of Defense Transportation, J. M. Johnson approves this legislation. Every advised agency and person almost without exception save for the representatives of the War Department approves this legislation.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. BOREN. Is it not true that every-one connected with rate making wants

this legislation so they can have an equalized approach to the problem?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Without exception they are in favor of it, and for one reason only: Because it is sound legislation in the interest of the country as well as the transportation system itself.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, seemingly the distinguished gentleman from Missouri and the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota have one great complaint relative to this legislation, and that is that on two different occasions the House has failed to agree with their viewpoint. This legislation has been enacted twice before by the House of Representatives by an almost unanimous vote. If I remember correctly, on one roll call there were but 16 votes cast against this legislation, and but 17 on the other occasion.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman also say that the House has defeated the legislation on two occasions?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It has not defeated the legislation at any time since I have been here.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation simply corrects an injustice. Up to this time the railroads have paid back many more millions of dollars in reduced freight rates than the property received from the Government was worth under any possible appraisal. For many years we have been compelling the shippers of your district and my district to pay higher rates than they should for civilian freight in order that Government freight could be hauled at rates far below the actual cost of such transportation to the railroad companies.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. In North Dakota the Government allowed the Indians 10 cents an acre for a big tract of land. The railroad was given every other section and when the railroad went through, it made the Government's land worth \$1.50 an acre.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Certainly the railroads have given much more to the Nation, both in transportation and in building up and developing the country, than they have ever received in the value of land granted to them.

This bill simply corrects an inequity. It has been reported with but a single vote in opposition by the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on two different occasions. It has been enacted and approved by this House on two different occasions. The only question left before us now is whether or not we shall adopt this conference report with the Senate amendment which extends the effective date to October 1 next, rather than 90 days after enactment as provided in the original House bill.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I cannot understand the position of those in opposition to this bill who appear to be, no doubt sincerely, interested in the shippers of the country, because every dollar that the Government takes away from the railroads in reduced freight rates means a greater transportation cost to the shippers of the country.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. Speaker, the laws of the land provide that the rates charged by the railroads must be fixed on a basis that will permit their operation at a fair and reasonable profit. Whenever any particular class of freight is being hauled at less than cost it is necessary the rates on other freight must be fixed sufficiently high to give the railroads the guaranteed return that the law provides.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Does the gentleman know that the railroads today still retain property that they do not need for their right of way, from which they are taking coal, copper, and oil? Are they willing to give that land back to the Government?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; I know that there are railroads that still retain some of the property originally granted to them. I also know, and so does the gentleman from Missouri, that many of the railroads that have been giving these special rate reductions to the Government have never received a bit of Government land, or have never benefited in any way from such land grants.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the gentleman will admit it, he knows the reason they have not got a dime is because of the way the railroad barons handled the property.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be well for the House to consider again for the moment the exact facts. When a shipment of merchandise by the Government leaves New York and goes to some place, for illustration, either in Florida, or in Texas, or in Missouri, or anywhere else, it will go by the most direct route. However, the people who figure the rates in the War Department and in the Navy Department will find a route which has the maximum amount of land-grant road in it and figure the rate over a very circuitous route in order to take advantage of a bit of land-grant discount. The freight is not shipped over the circuitous route. It is shipped over the direct route where there may be no land-grant road traversed. The net discount is computed, which may be 1 percent, 9 percent, or whatever percent it takes, from the straight line route to figure the Government rate. Then each of the railroads participating in this shipment through their connecting lines

take a proportionate reduction in the rate, whether or not there is any land grant on the road. The land-grant roads do not alone pay this bill. All the railroads and all the shippers in the United States pay this bill. The average reduction in freight rates for the Government in all bills of lading is something like 7 percent. In the Transportation Act of 1940 there was inserted a paragraph which provides that the Government may negotiate a rate with the railroads at a discount. That discount has not been set. There has been no negotiations, because the land-grant rates are still in effect. When the land-grant rates are repealed the Government will immediately negotiate with the railroads for a common discount on all Government shipments, and consequently the statement made by the gentleman from Missouri that the Government will lose money if this bill is passed is utterly fantastic. It is not true in any sense whatsoever.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. I would like to have the gentleman show me where in the act of 1940 there is anything that makes it mandatory that the railroads reduce the Government rates.

Mr. HINSHAW. There is no mandatory provision at all. It is a negotiated discount, and it is then up to the Interstate Commerce Commission to approve that rate discount.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have listened very intently to the arguments that have been made by the opponents of this conference report. I have failed to see any argument made that has not previously been made to this House. The effect, of those arguments, or more properly speaking their lack of effectiveness, in the past is evidenced by the fact that on one occasion there were only 16 Members in the House who agreed with those arguments, and at another time only 17 Members.

I do want to take some exception to the inference that has been drawn that the passage of this legislation is against the public interest. I cannot conceive how anyone who has given this matter any study whatsoever could come to any such conclusion, and when any Member of this House rises and bases his opposition against the adoption of this conference report upon the ground that he is seeking to protect the interests of the people, he is arguing contrary to the established facts in the case.

Furthermore, it would seem from the making of such an argument that those individuals consider themselves the only ones who are interested in the welfare of the people. When this House passed this legislation by a vote of 273 to 16, does the gentleman mean to imply that all of those Members who voted for the adoption of the legislation and many of whom have rendered outstanding service in protecting the public interest and have always been champions of the welfare of

the people suddenly changed and voted against the interests of the people?

Examine the conference report and you will see the names of the individuals who signed that report, both on the part of the Senate and the House. The names that are there set forth are those of Members who have time after time, on many occasions, stood foremost in the fight for the people of the country and for the protection of their welfare. It is inconceivable to me that individuals of the kind and character who have signed this conference report would be so totally oblivious of the best interest of the people as those who have spoken against the conference report would have us believe.

This bill in fact is to protect the interest of the general public. Why should the Government be given the privilege of using our railroads at a rate far below what the other shippers and individuals of the Nation are required to pay? Is it not plain to any thoughtful mind that as long as the Government enjoys this privilege that the deficit must be made up by the others who use the railroads? And in conclusion, may I call to your attention that the only issue before the House today is whether this conference report shall be adopted. The merits of the bill have been discussed and debated on two previous occasions and it has won the approval of the House and the Senate. Today the only question before the House is whether the provision in the House bill fixing the effective date of the act as 90 days after its enactment shall prevail, or whether the provision shall be changed so that the bill will be effective on October 1 of next year. That is the only issue before the House.

Therefore, it seems to me that all this argument this afternoon by opponents of the conference report is extraneous to the real issue. The merits of the bill have been fought out on several occasions by this House and in two instances received the approval of the House by overwhelming majorities. I do not think the gentleman from Missouri has any better record in the House for standing for what is for the best interest of the people than I have. I am just as conscientiously in favor of this bill as being one that is in the general interest as is the gentleman who has sought in his argument to make it appear to the contrary.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman says the only issue here is whether the bill shall go into effect in 90 days or on October 1, 1946. If the House will vote down this conference report as it did a few weeks ago and continue to vote it down, the legislation will never go into effect.

Mr. WOLVERTON. The reason that prompted action in the House 2 weeks ago to vote down the conference report then presented does not exist today. This report is a new one that does not contain the features to which the House objected. Therefore those reasons no longer exist. They have been eliminated by the conferees. The bill is now in the same condition as when the House ap-



proved it by an overwhelming majority except as to the date when it shall become effective. Therefore, the only issue that remains is that which I have stated. I urge the House to approve the conference report now before it.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, by undertaking to speak on this matter I do not want thereby to indicate there is any question in my mind as to whether or not this conference report is going to be adopted, because I am sure it will be adopted. However, there has been a time or two when for some reason or other apparently our better judgment has not prevailed.

We have been talking about this matter of land-grant rates a long time. As far as I am concerned, I hope this will be the end of it. I understand the gentleman from Missouri has been in opposition to it for a long time, and I yield to him that sincerity of conviction that I hope he yields to me.

Mr. COCHRAN. I certainly do.

Mr. HALLECK. I can say the same for the gentleman from Minnesota. I would not say that anyone spoke on this except from conviction, but this happens to be one of those things where certain alleged arguments against it can be presented and, if one does not take the trouble to think about it pretty carefully, he may be inadvisedly persuaded by them. I am quite sure if he will take the trouble to look into the merits of the proposition, if he will look back of the first words that may be said about it, and if he will look for the real public interest, he cannot do anything but support it.

It is true that lands were given to the railroads, and subsequently the Government was afforded a 50-percent decrease in freight rates. I think it might well be argued, however, that those lands were given to the railroads as a contribution to the efforts to develop the great empire that is this country, that the development of the empire is all that the Government expected for those lands. But it has been pointed out that more than that, the Government in reduced rates has already received much more than the value of those lands that were granted.

Now, what is this thing all about? The railroads operate under rates fixed by the Government, by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The theory of such regulation is that rates are revised downward in the public interest. The theory is that rates shall be fixed at a point at which they shall pay operating costs and yield to the owners of the roads a fair return on their investment. That means that the railroads must obtain revenue from some place to carry on their operations. If the Government freight moves at 50 percent, who makes it up? Why, the shippers and the consumers of the country make it up. They must pay added rates in order to increase the revenue to the railroads to overcome the 50-percent reduction.

The gentleman from Missouri made an astounding statement here, if I understood him correctly. He said that the

Government rate of 50 percent is a profitable one for the railroads. Why, bless your hearts, if that statement were true, then the rate that you and I pay is twice too high. If the statement he made is true, then the Interstate Commerce Commission is doing a mighty poor job in not reducing freight rates. Now bear that in mind.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. I made the statement that the land-grant railroad rate must be satisfactory because the other roads which were land-grant railroads came to the Interstate Commerce Commission and secured permission to take Government freight and personnel at the same rate that the land-grant railroads were taking it. If they lose money, why are they so anxious for the business?

Mr. HALLECK. That does not answer my assertion at all and it does not in any way explain or strengthen the statement that the gentleman from Missouri made to the House. The competitive situation in railroad operations is known to all of us. They seek to get traffic wherever they can. And, secondly, it cannot be disputed, if the 50-percent rate is enough to afford a railroad an opportunity to make money, then the Interstate Commerce Commission has our rate twice too high.

Let me point out just one thing further. One-third of the railroads were in receivership before the war. Another third were running in the red before the war. Two-thirds of our railroads were running in the red. Many of them were right in the areas where these land-grant rates apply. The statement has been made that from Chicago comes the suggestion that rates will have to be increased. I say to the gentleman from Missouri, Do you want the Government to continue to have a 50-percent rate when the private shippers of the country are confronted with an increase in their rates? Let all of the taxpayers pay the fair bill in moving the freight of the United States Government.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'HARA) there were—ayes 159, noes 44.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-seven Members are present; a quorum.

So the conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that those who spoke on the conference report may have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk two privileged resolutions and ask for their immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 436

*Resolved*, That ROY CLIPPINGER, of Illinois, be and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on Roads, the Committee on War Claims, and the Committee on Patents of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 437

*Resolved*, That FRANK A. MATHEWS, Jr., of New Jersey, be and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, the Committee on War Claims, the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and the Committee on the Census of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF DECEMBER 3

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to find out, if we can, the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wish to advise the membership that there is another conference report we are waiting to act on this afternoon, the conference report on the rescission bill. It is not quite ready, but when it is reported we intend to bring it up this afternoon, unless something unforeseen develops. Possibly some Members may be recognized under special orders in the meanwhile.

The program for next week will be as follows:

Monday and Tuesday: On Monday the Consent Calendar will be called. If the conference report on the rescission bill is not acted upon today it will be brought up on Monday. The following bills will be in order on Monday and Tuesday—I am bracketing them into 2 days: The Second War Powers Act, the First War Powers Act, the Navy personnel bill.

The Private Calendar will be called on Tuesday.

Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday: For these days I am bracketing three bills. If a rule is reported out in time—and I hope it is—the UNRRA bill, H. R. 4649, will be called up Wednesday and be the continuing order of business until disposed of.

Thereafter the bill (H. R. 4717) to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration,

to which the gentleman from Mississippi referred this morning and which I intended to bring up as soon as possible anyway, will be in order.

Thereafter the Bulwinkle bill (H. R. 2536) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers, will be called up.

That is the program for next week. Conference reports may, of course, be brought in at any time they are ready for consideration.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

#### PROBLEMS FACING THE RETURNING VETERAN

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, the serviceman has many problems facing him in his return to civilian life. Congress, through the GI bill of rights and other veterans' legislation, has to a great extent anticipated and provided for the answers to most of these problems—in some cases giving interim relief until such time as he becomes reestablished. However, no veteran can begin to resume his civilian pursuits until he can find a place to live, and in this hunt he finds himself up against the most severe housing shortage in the memory of man. The wives of most of these men were either physically or financially unable to take care of the houses they were occupying at the time of induction into the service, and were forced to move their families and either double up with other servicemen's families or go back to their parents, either of which was an emergency makeshift.

With the present shortage of building materials, it is expected that new houses will be well under 500,000 in the next year, which, together with the present housing situation, will leave about a million veterans and their families homeless at the end of the year.

I recently attended a meeting at the veterans' service center at Silver Spring, Md., which was called for the purpose of arriving at ways and means of finding homes for local veterans. The facts brought out at that meeting were unbelievable and appalling, but I shall not burden you with the details, which I am sure are typical of conditions throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, something must be done, and quickly, to alleviate this situation. We cannot have our veterans who have done such a splendid job, and for whom we have been waving flags and sounding cymbals, walking the streets, or at best living in overcrowded houses with other families.

There have been several suggested remedies, none of which completely meet the situation, but would contribute to the solution.

As many of the public and private houses recently constructed were earmarked to or preempted for war workers, the veteran is practically blocked

from this source. Lack of availability of materials is handicapping construction, and many of the homes that are being built are beyond the purchase reach of the veteran.

The situation will not be materially aided until a department on veterans' housing is set up under the National Housing Authority, with its efforts directed exclusively to the veterans' housing problems. Many needs could be met, including priorities for houses to be built, sold, and rented to veterans—building materials earmarked for veterans. The important thing at the moment is to have some agency charged with the responsibility of the veterans' housing problems, with the time and facilities to devote its entire activities to this end.

#### MACARTHUR AND THE REDS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is a conservative estimate to say that the United States was 95 percent responsible for victory against Japan.

While American vessels kept the breath of life in Britons and Russians during the European war, while American know-how on the battle line and on the production line brought victory out of certain defeat, Britain made only token efforts to help us in the Far East and the Soviet Union contributed no effort whatsoever.

It was not Britain who made immortal the battlefields of Buna and Lae. The daily bombing attacks on Rabaul were not merely a British "milk run." No British force landed in the Solomons and fought through the bloody Guadalcanal campaign. No proud British Fleet sent its carrier-borne planes against the so-called impregnable enemy base at Truk.

Where were the Soviet commandos? They did not undertake over half-a-hundred successful triphibious operations in the Philippines alone. They took no Saipan, no Iwo Jima, no Okinawa. The vaunted Russian Navy was bottled up in the Black Sea or icebound in the Baltic when our Navy was sinking the pride of the Japanese Navy from Midway through the Battle of Leyte Gulf and into Japan's own Inland Sea.

Yet, when the tumult and the shouting has died, when the war has been won—by the United States—then, Stalin signified his intention of moving in so that he and a socialized Britain can run Japan. There is no secret diplomacy in Stalin's position. There is no need for it. The time for secret diplomacy has passed. Stalin's open desire is to communize Japan.

What, then, is Britain's position in this unholy alliance? Britain wants to trade what America has won by expending the lives of American youth and the wealth of the American taxpayer to the Russians. For what? For what Britain fears she will lose and which she is impotent to protect—her subject empire in the Far East, the oil-rich British-dominated

lands of the Middle East, and the Mediterranean lifeline to her middle eastern dependencies and far eastern possessions.

America—and America's fighting leader in the Far East—won the war the hard way. The phrase "too little and too late" might have been coined about Gen. Douglas MacArthur's tag end of men and material furnished him to fight a major war. It was a national scandal, in an era replete with national scandals, that General MacArthur was denied the necessities for waging war, as many people persistently believe, because some people thought that—if the great commander was furnished with men and guns and ships and tanks—MacArthur would win and that would make him a political threat.

In the midst of a neglect which might well have been a deliberate betrayal, MacArthur proved his unimpeachable military genius. He fought an uphill battle—from Bataan to Port Moresby, from Port Moresby to Lingayan Gulf, from Manila to Okinawa, and to Japan's inland sea itself. Never has MacArthur failed to give quick credit to his combat team. His praise has gone to the Air Forces, to the Navy, to the Filipino guerrillas, to the men who brought badly needed replacements, and to the men and women who planned, managed, and worked in building the vital weapons of war. And MacArthur was a leader as well as a team player. There is no doubt about the innate leadership of the man who headed one of the most brilliant military campaigns in all history, and who is—this very minute—displaying that same unerring judgment which has always marked his leadership in an administrative capacity in governing defeated Japan.

But scarcely had the ink dried on the momentous surrender document signed aboard the U. S. S. *Missouri*, when the acclimated Communists and socialized snipers in continental United States—following Moscow's party line—began a smear campaign against America's hero of the Far East. They have howled, and they continue to howl, that Stalin ought to have the real voice of authority concerning the governing of Japan, after going along for a brief and easy ride in an 8-day war. Editors who clamored about American "imperialism" while Russia was still a member of a mutual protection pact with Hitler, went all-out to blacken the name of the very man to whom they owed, in great part, their very freedom of expression. But these Communists of every shade from dark red to pale pink, have blunted their editorial pens against the hard common sense of true American thinking. The American people are growing increasingly aware of General MacArthur's value to them in peace as well as war.

Meanwhile, the British monetary delegation is in Washington today seeking a five- or six-billion-dollar gift to be paid to them out of the United States Treasury, gleaned from the war bonds and taxes on American citizens, so that Britain can bring about the reconstruction of her socialized industries to compete on the world markets with American private enterprise. But the British are not too busy, nor are they too financially em-



barrassed that, even while they are making this outrageous demand, they could forego the opportunity to scream for an important role in governing Japan, whose armed might they did so little to defeat. To paraphrase Churchill concerning the American relationship with the British in the Far East: "Never did such a large country owe so little to a small country for doing nothing."

But, at least, American newsmen and American military observers have been permitted on British soil. That has never been the case with Russia. Even in the days of shuttle bombing, American airmen who flew from Italy to Russia and bombed the satellite bases in between, were virtual prisoners on the narrow airstrips upon which Stalin permitted them to land. American newsmen in Moscow are never out of sight of the Russian equivalent of the gestapo. One may count on the fingers of both hands the number of accredited American correspondents allowed in Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and the Soviet zone of occupation in Germany. Where Soviet puppet governments exist in unilaterally controlled territory, freedom of the press most certainly does not exist. In fact, in all instances, the Soviet Union has shown complete contempt for the mythical four freedoms to which Stalin once subscribed.

Reports of so-called food riots, thefts, obstructionism, and downright opposition to American control in Japan have a familiar ring. They are definitely in the Communist pattern of starting with petty annoyances and culminating in an incident. Nor, on the record of past performances, can it be expected that the Communists want only a partial control of Japan. In the words of the popular song, they want all, or nothing at all. And we know that they will not be satisfied with nothing at all. They have never sought modest control: they seek absolute control.

If Japan could be communized, it is as certain that China would soon follow into the insatiable maw of communism. Already, according to a November 24 dispatch from Frederick Kuh in London, British authorities are of the opinion that Russia has Manchuria in the bag. With the possibilities of expanding southward, the aspirations of Stalin to become a twentieth century Genghis Khan become apparent. By indoctrinating training and equipping the Asiatic hordes, Stalin could well be planning to overrun the world. It would take all our people, all our know-how, all our courage, all our scientific research in the field of the atomic bomb, and in other fields, to stave off this greatest of all man-masses.

We have no assurances of Soviet good faith in international affairs. Soviet arrogance wrecked the recent London Conference of Foreign Ministers. Soviet demands nearly brought an end to the United Nations Conference on International Organization at San Francisco. Nor is it wise to forget that Soviet Russia showed no concern for the peoples of other European countries—except to absorb them—while Hitler was undertaking his earlier aggression. In fact, Stalin

participated in the dismemberment of Poland in 1939. He did not fight for humanity or for the ideals of humanity. Stalin fought only when his own dictatorship, Russia, was attacked by his fellow dictator. Russians did not enter upon an offensive outside their own country until well into 1944.

A final factor must be taken in consideration before making any such irresponsible move as that of giving up the battle-won American control over Japan. By giving in to Soviet pressure and submitting to their demands that we give them a place of equality on a control commission, General MacArthur would lose face before the Japanese people, and any effort for him to exercise his authority would be met by passive disobedience. The authority of the United States as an administrative factor in Japan would be at an end. We would have lost all the ground we have gained in the Far East, both during the war and after the war—for, when a nation loses face before an oriental people that nation can never regain it.

Here is a clear-cut decision to be made. Will we forfeit the fruits of victory? Or will we retain them? Will we level our Pacific defenses? Or will we make those defenses stronger? The cleavage is even simpler than that: Which man is America to follow in its dealings with the Far East—Stalin or MacArthur? As for me, my decision is made. I stand for keeping the fruits of our victory. I urge the maintenance of the front line of American Pacific defenses in Japan itself. I choose MacArthur.

#### RANK OF CHIEFS OF BUREAUS IN THE NAVY DEPARTMENT

Mr. VINSON submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 1862) relating to the rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes.

JAMES F. SCANLON

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, today the Congress, and especially the Committee on Appropriations, will lose the services of one of its most valuable employees when James F. Scanlon, administrative assistant to the Committee on Appropriations because of long and faithful service becomes eligible for retirement and will exercise that right.

Jim, or Uncle Jim, as he is affectionately known on Capitol Hill, came to Washington many years ago and was employed by the House of Representatives. By the time I became a Member of the Congress, Jim was almost as much a fixture of the Committee on Appropriations as the paintings on the walls and the famous chandeliers that hang from the ceilings of the committee room. And when I became a Member of the committee, I soon learned why he was so valuable.

Early in his service he realized that an important part of the history of this Nation would be written in the proceedings and policies of the Appropriations

Committee; and proceeded to keep accurate records of hearings held by the committees and of the preservation of same. In addition to his normal functions he undertook this most difficult and important task of perfecting and preserving the records of the Committee on Appropriations in a manner seldom equaled. Today the records of this important committee are most complete and in demand as reference material, not only of current proceedings but of those of past Congresses which serve as an accurate portrayal of the policies that have been followed through some of the most hectic years of the Nation's existence. There is not a day passes that many of us do not have occasion to refer to records accurately prepared and preserved as a result of the foresight and industry of Jim Scanlon.

As the Committee on Appropriations grew in importance with the growth and progress of the Nation, Uncle Jim grew in stature. He always was competent, industrious, and courteous. His personality was always such that he secured cooperation. We found it a pleasure to work with him. His faults through the years, if he had any, have become virtues, and it is my sincerest wish that he may enjoy these virtues and the well-earned retirement for many, many years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations who has been closely associated with Jim Scanlon for more than a decade, I join the gentleman from Pennsylvania in expressing appreciation for the excellent services rendered by this faithful and efficient employee of the House who is about to retire. I have found him to be courteous and dependable at all times and under all circumstances. I am certain that the sentiment expressed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is that of every member of the Appropriations Committee. Jim Scanlon will be missed by every member of the Committee on Appropriations. I am sure that I speak the sentiment of every member of our committee when I join in wishing Mr. Scanlon good health, happiness, and godspeed.

Mr. SNYDER. I thank the gentleman.

#### UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to read a statement by Herbert H. Lehman, Director General of UNRRA, in regard to an erroneous press report:

It is unfortunate indeed that UNRRA, at this critical time, should have to defend itself against an erroneous press report from Europe which, it must be said in credit to the press association which carried it, was immediately corrected.

The original dispatch, for which there was no foundation in fact, said that UNRRA had "dismissed, suspended, or arrested more than 600 of its workers accused of diverting relief supplies into the black market." The dispatch said further that "a majority of the workers involved were Americans and Britons."

I have investigated the matter thoroughly. The facts are these:

General Morgan, chief of our operations in Germany, is now completing a reorganization. Over the last few months the services of 600 UNRRA workers have been terminated for various reasons, including incompetency, illness, lack of adaptability, and other causes. These workers were chiefly European nationals, employed on the scene of operations, and not Americans and Britons.

The unfortunate news dispatch, through some misunderstanding, linked this reorganization with the UNRRA announcement that one UNRRA worker of Czech nationality was imprisoned for theft and sale to the black market of coffee intended for displaced persons, and that 13 other workers were suspended as the result of an UNRRA investigation into charges of black-market operations.

For several months a tightening-up process in UNRRA operations has been under way. This has been done under my direction. UNRRA officials in this country have been in constant touch with every move. I have assured congressional committees that we have been replacing employees who have been found to be unsuitable with stronger personnel, now that the war is over and better-trained and more experienced workers are available to us.

In line with this policy, Lt. Gen. Sir Humphrey Gale, former administrative officer to General Eisenhower, has been appointed my personal representative in charge of the European regional office in London; and Lt. Gen. Sir Frederick Morgan, former deputy chief of staff under General Eisenhower, has been made director of the UNRRA displaced persons operation in Germany.

I wish to reiterate here a statement I have made many times, and which was also made by Lieutenant General Morgan from Herford, Germany:

"UNRRA officials are doing everything in their power to ferret out any incompetence and dishonesty in the ranks. The overwhelming majority of the UNRRA workers are honest, sincere, and loyal, and dedicated to the care of the displaced persons who are innocent victims of the war."

I believe that the steps we have been taking and are taking to weed out unsuitable personnel and to stamp out black-market operations and theft so far as possible are evidence of the increasing effectiveness of UNRRA operations.

#### AUTHORIZING POSTMASTER GENERAL TO ADJUST CERTAIN CLAIMS

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 4127, an act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Postmaster General to adjust certain claims of postmasters for loss by burglary, fire, or other unavoidable casualty," approved March 17, 1882, as amended, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 3, line 16, strike out "this limitation shall not apply" and insert "the limitation shall be 2 years as."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the Senate amendment?

Mr. BURCH. The Senate amendment simply limits the time in which they shall file claim to 2 years.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is that the only change?

Mr. BURCH. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AUTHORIZING POSTMASTERS IN ALASKA TO ADMINISTER OATHS AND AFFIRMATIONS

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 304, an act to amend the act authorizing postmasters in Alaska to administer oaths and affirmations, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

After line 14 insert:

"Each certificate of oath, affirmation, or acknowledgment executed by a postmaster within the Territory of Alaska under the authority of this act shall be signed by the postmaster, with a designation of his title as such postmaster, shall have affixed thereto the cancellation stamp of the post office, and shall state the name of the post office and the date on which such oath or affirmation is administered or such acknowledgment is taken. Postmasters shall keep a memorandum of all deeds and other instruments of writing acknowledged before them and relating to the title to or transfer of property, which memorandum shall be transmitted to their successors in the office of postmaster and which shall be subject to public inspection."

With the following amendment:

Before the Senate amendment, insert the following: "And that section 2 of said act approved August 5, 1939, is amended to read as follows."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is pretty broad authority to bestow on a postmaster. Will the gentleman explain the reason for it?

Mr. BURCH. In Alaska, on account of the sparseness of the settlements and the people, it is very difficult to reach the proper officers in order to have acknowledgements made.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This applies only to Alaska?

Mr. BURCH. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in with an amendment.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### POST OFFICES SERVING MILITARY AND NAVAL PERSONNEL

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 697 an act relating to clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 9 and 10, after "stations," insert "or at civilian plants devoted to war production."

Page 2, line 1, after "stations," insert "or civilian plants."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the amendment?

Mr. BURCH. Under existing law, postal employees who are stationed at Army stations or any other Government stations of that kind away from their regular places of business are allowed a per diem of only \$2.50 for maintenance. This increases the per diem to not to exceed \$4.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It has the approval of the Department and all the members of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads?

Mr. BURCH. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is a unanimous report of the gentleman's committee?

Mr. BURCH. It is a unanimous report of the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials by H. B. Snyder appearing in the Gary Post-Tribune, of Gary, Ind.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and include a letter and some newspaper clippings.

#### HOUSE PERIODICAL PRESS GALLERY

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts I



offer a privileged resolution, House Resolution 438, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation at the rate of \$2,700 per annum, payable monthly, for the services of a superintendent of the House Periodical Press Gallery, who shall be designated by the Speaker.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This merely gives facilities to the House Periodical Press Gallery?

Mr. COCHRAN. They already have the facilities, but there is nobody up in the room to look after the place.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This just gives them what the other services have?

Mr. COCHRAN. That is right, but not quite as much help.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Is this only for weekly publications?

Mr. COCHRAN. Weekly and monthly publications. They are not in the press gallery upstairs; they have a private gallery.

Mr. STEFAN. This provides service for the weekly and monthly publications?

Mr. COCHRAN. That is right.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### STRIKES ON MOTOR TRANSPORTATION LINES

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

#### THIS GANGSTERISM MUST GO!

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, tragedy struck out our way, the other day, and I take this time to speak of it because it concerns America.

Two men who were not members of a drivers' union on strike, attempting to move some perishable goods for the Buckingham Transportation Co. were set upon, beaten, kicked, and trampled by eight men, later identified by them as fellow employees of the company. Today the trucks of the company are moving under escort of the State patrol.

The Governor, M. Q. Sharpe, I understand, has said that there will be no violation of law like that permitted in South Dakota while he has a State patrol or guard at his command. But that is not the angle of the matter I wish to bring to your attention.

The point to which I call your attention is the fact that this gangster incident was apparently incited by the In-

ternational Committee of the Drivers' Union in Chicago, which is technically and actually beyond the reach of South Dakota law.

The drivers in South Dakota did not go on strike when the Midwest strike began. On November 15 they were called upon by the international agent in Chicago to strike, although a vote on the matter had never been taken. Some 10 days later, on a demand by the company for a formal action on the matter, they did so vote.

Perishable goods had been forwarded to the Buckingham Co., which it attempted to move. While the two nonunion employees were in a lunch room getting coffee along the road at night, their truck was tampered with so that it would not start when they came out. As they stood on the fenders, raising the hood to check what was wrong, they were attacked by men coming from the dark side of the truck, held, beaten, knocked to the ground, and otherwise pummeled until nearly unconscious.

Whether the attackers were drunk I do not know, but, drunk or sober, their acts were not rational or normal. As identified by the victims, they had been respected, trusted, long-time employees of the company. People in the community who have written me about the incident say they do not believe these men proposed the attack and are at a loss to understand it, save by incitement of the international committee in Chicago which ordered the strike and which has done its best to inflame the men in this local a thousand miles away.

Now, it was a tragedy that the two men should have been beaten in this brutal way. One of them may have suffered a permanent injury to an eye. But it is an even greater tragedy for America, in my opinion, that eight normally rational and respected men should have been incited to such an inhuman piece of gangsterism. It has no place in America.

It is all very well to say, "We cannot control what men do." It is all very well to say, "We must not consider labor legislation now; we must give the President's management and employee conference a chance to work out a plan for voluntary arbitration of industrial disputes"; but I want to say without qualification that such action or lack of action will not and does not satisfy the rank and file of the American people.

Nor do I believe that the United States can leave to management and labor the answer to all questions involved in labor disputes. Sometimes one, and sometimes the other is at fault. Sometimes one, and sometimes the other, refuses to negotiate or arbitrate. There must be a court or tribunal to which either one can appeal.

And above and beyond that, Mr. Speaker, there must be a place where a third party, the public, can appeal, in all disputes involving health, safety, and a high degree of public welfare.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is the duty of the Congress to provide a labor tribunal to which either party can appeal in a contested interpretation of a labor contract, and to

which the public can appeal in any work stoppage affecting public health or safety and high public interest.

There must be positive provisions of law to give such a court the strength and dignity necessary to permit it to do the needed job. It must have power to enforce contracts, to punish wildcat strikes on the one hand, or irresponsible lock-outs on the other.

I recognize that under the Constitution we cannot have involuntary servitude in America and we do not want it. But this Nation has gone a long way to set up social security for the workers and protection of property for the employers. Surely, the Nation has the power to stop or deny benefits which it has created when the conduct of the recipients is such as to jeopardize the ability of the Nation to continue them.

No work stoppage should be permitted, by whatever party proposed, which endangers the health and safety of the Nation or the lives of its citizens under penalty of forfeiture of the benefits which the Nation has established. And no work stoppage should be permitted in the field of public health and safety without due notice to the public and a submission of the issues at stake to a properly constituted tribunal.

Mr. Speaker, nothing less than this will satisfy the awakening conscience and indignation of the country. The Nation which has fought for peace abroad demands peace at home.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### THE SUGAR SITUATION

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, amidst all of the bungling of food administration by the Federal Government throughout the war, none has been more confused than the administration-made chaotic conditions concerning sugar.

The rationing of meat and other commodities, finally lifted on November 23, 1945, should have been lifted months before. But sugar still remains a rationed food, and probably will remain on the rationing list for many months to come simply because those in authority who presume to be experts, mismanaged procurement of adequate sugar supplies. Even at this late date final agreement with Cuban producers, the principal source of our supply, has not been reached, although negotiations have been going on sporadically for five or more months, and the crop itself was planted last May and June.

The Republican Congressional Food Study Committee which, I am glad to point out, has been correct in its analysis of every phase of our food problems since its creation 2½ years ago, has made a very careful study of our potential 1946 sugar supply. In this study we have found that there will be a very substantial increase in the amount of sugar available for civilian use in 1946. If this unofficial committee, composed of Members of Congress, who have a vast number of other congressional duties to perform, can ascertain the facts in matters

of this kind, why is it that the governmental agencies directly responsible under the law to handle these problems, cannot or do not ascertain the facts, make decisions and promulgate the necessary regulations, allocations, and information so that the American people can know just what they are facing?

As I shall point out in a detailed analysis, there will be available for civilian domestic consumption in 1946 some 6,500,000 short tons of sugar, as compared with approximately 5,000,000 tons allocated in the year 1945. This means that a very substantial increase can be made in 1946 over the amounts allocated to civilian and commercial usage in 1945.

Industry is entitled to know and to be advised by the Government at the earliest possible moment so that it can plan accordingly. This has not been the practice of the administration during recent years. American industry has not survived and grown under the American system through utter stupidity and luck, but because it has been able to gage and plan its course. Those responsible in the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration should recognize this fact and stop their everlasting procrastination in reaching decisions or in making false promises. They should immediately make known to industry what the allocations will be for the first quarter of 1946 and certainly not later than December 1 or December 10.

The domestic sugar-beet and sugar-cane crops that will be used for 1946 consumption are almost completely harvested. The harvest of the Cuban sugar crop, planted months ago, will begin about January 15, while the Puerto Rico crop, planted about the same time, will come to its harvest around the 1st of February. Industry and trade already knows what the probable harvest from these primary sources will be. The Department of Agriculture should act so that the industrial users and the civilian consumers of the country will know the facts and be able to plan.

One of the largest commercial users of sugar is the baking industry. In 1944 all commercial users were allocated 80 percent of their 1941 consumption. In 1945 the bakers were cut to 65 percent, and all others except pharmaceutical manufacturers were reduced to 50 percent of their 1941 consumption. The baking industry will have an increased demand for their products in 1946 with the return of many of our servicemen and women to civilian life, while military requirements of sugar will be decreased proportionately. Thus with increased supplies, it becomes more necessary that early announcement be made of the substantially increased allocations that are possible.

A few weeks ago a report came to this country that 1,600,000 short tons of sugar had been found in Java. According to the report we have received, this information was delivered to the Secretary of Agriculture late in the day and he immediately called in newspaper reporters without checking with his sugar experts or his own public relations office, to rush into print with the story that all of our sugar problems would be solved by this discovery. We are informed further

that officials of the United States Army have made an investigation in Java, and they have found that there is raw sugar in Java equivalent to 1,400,000 tons, 1,000,000 tons of which is in bags and 400,000 tons of which is in bulk. This sugar is distributed in different parts of Java where civil war is going on. Some of it is at ports where lighters will have to be used to load it onto ships, if ships can be made available. Bags will have to be imported from India in which to place the bulk sugar. From the best information available, and notwithstanding the statement of the Secretary of Agriculture, it would appear that not one single pound of that Javanese sugar will become available for American use in 1946. If it does become available, then the following carefully prepared estimate of sugar supplies should be increased by that amount.

The following table is a composite tabulation of information from at least three different sources within the sugar industry of availability of sugar in 1946:

Sugar supply, 1946	
Stock:	Short tons
Carry-over, Dec. 31, 1945.....	900,000
Cuba.....	4,650,000
Puerto Rico.....	1,050,000
Hawaii.....	900,000
Domestic:	
Beet.....	1,500,000
Cane.....	550,000
Miscellaneous.....	50,000
Total.....	9,600,000
Less:	
Local consumption: Cuba and	
Puerto Rico.....	300,000
South America.....	150,000
United Kingdom and Canada.....	600,000
Total.....	1,050,000
Available to United States.....	8,550,000
Military requirements.....	350,000
Foreign relief.....	250,000
Total.....	600,000
Net available.....	7,950,000
Carry-over, Dec. 31, 1946.....	1,450,000
Net available to United States civilians in 1946.....	6,500,000

It will be noted in the foregoing table that in addition to eliminating any sugar from Java, it is contemplated that there will be no sugar available from the Philippine Islands; at least one trade source estimates that we may secure 150,000 tons from the Philippine Islands. If we do, it should be added to this table. It is also probable that the amount of sugar for foreign relief can be slightly reduced from the 250,000 tons stated in this table. There is a surplus of sugar in Czechoslovakia which can be used for relief purposes in Yugoslavia and Greece.

Just as the Office of Price Administration regulations were responsible for and created black markets in other commodities, the mismanagement of the problems related to sugar production and distribution are responsible for a kindred situation. At least two large companies, one preparing sirup for commercial users and the other a soft-drink beverage corporation, are reliably reported to have devised methods for evading the restrictions on sugar consumption made necessary by poor administration. One of

these companies is reported to have leased four of the largest sugar mills in Louisiana, and is offering a sirup to commercial users at a price of \$1.50 to \$2 a gallon, which contains the equivalent of about 8 or 9 pounds of sugar. These mills will be able to process sugar-cane equivalent to some 15,000 tons of refined sugar.

Mr. Speaker, by way of emphasis, I repeat, there is every indication that after making allowances of an increase of 500,000 or more tons of sugar for carry-over from one season to the other, there will be available for civilian domestic consumption at least 1,500,000 more tons than was available in 1945. The Secretary of Agriculture should take steps now to make allocations for the first quarter of 1946 for commercial use and home consumption substantially greater than were made for the first quarter of 1945. It is recognized that much of this sugar will not be available until the quarter is half over. But if the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration are more interested in the welfare of the American people than in the maintenance of governmental bureaucracy regimenting them into un-American patterns, the people will be promptly informed of sugar allotments for 1946, and industry will be able to plan accordingly.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. I am very much interested in what the gentleman says about the taking over of certain sugar factories in this country by certain industries. For instance, I had a rumor—it might be a rumor or it might not be—less than an hour ago to the effect there is some sort of order about to come out from Chester Bowles' office or some other office, which if it is announced will indicate that one of these great concerns is going to be given preference that no other concern of the kind in the country will be given. I hate to ask the gentleman about a rumor, but since he is the outstanding sugar man in the House I thought perhaps he might know something about it.

Mr. JONKMAN. I have heard such a rumor myself. We are trying to verify it at the present time, we are checking up and will probably have some information a little later.

#### DISCHARGE OF MIDSHIPMEN FROM UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

Mr. VINSON submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 1064) to authorize discharge of midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy because of unsatisfactory conduct or aptitude.

#### PROVIDE FOR NATIONAL ELECTIONS IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file a committee report on House Joint Resolution 278, to provide for national elections in the Philippine Islands.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.



## RECESS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the House will stand in recess until 3:45 p. m.

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.), the House stood in recess until 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.

## COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the so-called rescission bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, may I ask if this conference report on the rescission bill can be made the first order of business on Monday next?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I have previously announced that if the conference report on the so-called rescission bill is not acted on today, it will be the first order of business on Monday after the call of bills on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the majority leader if it will be possible to make this the first order of business on Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conference report on the rescission bill may precede the call of the Consent Calendar on Monday.

The SPEAKER. It is not necessary to obtain unanimous consent for that. The Chair can recognize the gentleman to call up the conference report before the call of the Consent Calendar and will do so.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That will be agreeable to me, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Then I shall ask recognition to call up the conference report immediately after the reading of the Journal.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Admiral Denfeld regarding the moral situation in Tokyo.

## FOREIGN POLICY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution of inquiry requesting the Secretary of

State to report to the House full information regarding the sabotage of our foreign policy in China and full information regarding the resignation of Gen. Patrick Hurley as ambassador.

Mr. Speaker, in case the chairman of our Committee on Foreign Affairs does not call General Hurley, I have asked Senator CONNALLY, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to allow our House Foreign Affairs Committee members to sit in on their Senate hearings on Wednesday.

Several days ago I asked on the House floor that the Speaker of the House invite General Hurley to appear before the Members to tell about conditions in China which led to his resignation. Congress, the press, and the people of the country should be given full information.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mrs. LUCE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), for Saturday and Monday, on account of official business.

To Mr. STEVENSON (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), on account of illness.

## BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4350. An act to amend section 3646 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the issuance of checks in replacement of lost, stolen, destroyed, mutilated, or defaced checks of the United States, and for other purposes.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, December 3, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

## COMMITTEE HEARINGS

## COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10:30 a. m. on Tuesday, December 4, 1945, in room 245, New House Office Building, to consider H. R. 4719.

## COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

The Committee on the Census will hold a hearing at 10 o'clock a. m. on Thursday, December 6, 1945, on H. R. 4781, in room 1414, New House Office Building.

## COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary has scheduled a hearing to begin at 10 a. m. on Friday, December 7, 1945, on the bill, H. R. 4779, to enable debtor railroad corporations, whose properties during a period of 7 years have provided sufficient earnings to pay fixed charges, to effect a readjustment of their financial structure without further proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as

amended. The hearing will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

846. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting pursuant to section 16 of the organic act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, a copy of a bill passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

847. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the payment on a commuted basis of the costs of transportation of dependents of certain persons entitled to such transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

848. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Salvatore Carbone; to the Committee on Claims.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4857. A bill to expedite the admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces; without amendment (Rept. No. 1320). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FLANNAGAN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 4769. A bill to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1321). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 438. Resolution providing compensation for the employment of a superintendent of the House Periodical Press Gallery; without amendment (Rept. No. 1323). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4844. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of the alien Chinese wives of American citizens who are admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than those authorizing exclusion on grounds of race or birth in a defined geographical area; with amendment (Rept. No. 1325). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BELL: Committee on Insular Affairs. House Joint Resolution 278. Joint resolution to provide for national elections in the Philippine Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1326). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARNESS of Indiana:

H. R. 4867. A bill to authorize the establishment of an additional coinage mint of the United States; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. CURLEY:

H. R. 4868. A bill to increase the salary of the President to \$100,000 per annum, to exempt such salary from Federal income taxes, and to increase the President's expense

allowance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 4869. A bill relating to acquisition of rights-of-way for levee construction on the north bank of the Arkansas River from Pine Bluff, Ark., to the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. Con Res. 105. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the manuscript entitled "Questions and Answers on the Current Revenue Act of 1945", as a House document, and providing for the printing of additional copies thereof; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 439. Resolution requesting the Federal Security Administrator to furnish to the House of Representatives certain information with respect to the drugs known as barbiturates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. Res. 440. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish to the House of Representatives certain information with respect to the drugs known as barbiturates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. Res. 441. Resolution creating a select committee to study the feasibility of establishing and operating floating, world-traveling universities; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 442. Resolution to provide for expenses for the investigation authorized by H. Res. 441; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 443. Resolution requesting the Secretary of State to give information regarding the resignation of Gen. Patrick J. Hurley and the sabotage of our foreign policy in China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1361. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution of the National Headquarters, Twenty-ninth Division Association, Inc., endorsing and recommending universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1362. By Mr. COFFEE: Petition of Joseph Sweat and 40,000 other citizens, for the passage of House Resolution 100 which is urging on behalf of the United States House of Representatives a diplomatic break with Franco (Fascist) Spain, and extension of lend-lease to the guerrilla armies of the Spanish Republic underground; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1363. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the ministers of the Beaver Federated Churches of Beaver, Pa., opposing compulsory peacetime conscription; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1364. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Board of Aldermen of the City of Newport, in opposition to the merger of the Army and Navy Departments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## SENATE

MONDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord of our pilgrim years, the day returns and brings us the round of its

concerns and duties. As in Thy sight we serve in posts of high public office, make us solemnly conscious that our thoughts, our attitudes, our words, and our acts are not our own but go out from this Chamber, set as a light on a hill, to influence and to mold the whole structure of human relationships around the world. Help us in all things to be masters of ourselves that we may be the servants of others.

In these times of tension and strain, preserve us from minding and magnifying little slights and stings, or giving them. Keep us calm in temper, clear walk humbly with Thee our God. In gratitude, meanness, or even treachery. In these crucial and creative days, enable us, we pray Thee, to perform faithfully and well what Thou dost require, even to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with Thee, our God. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, November 30, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On November 30, 1945:

S. 1459. An act to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases.

On December 3, 1945:

S. 1097. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's store at the United States Naval Academy;

S. 1215. An act to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel and former Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost in the disaster to the steamship *Maasdam* on June 28, 1941; and

S. 1494. An act to exempt Navy or Coast Guard vessels of special construction from the requirements as to the number, position, range, or arc of visibility of lights, and for other purposes.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had concurred in the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 304) to amend the act authorizing postmasters in Alaska to administer oaths and affirmations, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 697) relating to clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4127) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Postmaster General to adjust certain claims of postmasters for loss by burglary, fire, or other unavoidable casualty," approved March 17, 1882, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the

committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 694) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 694. An act to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic;

H. R. 697. An act relating to clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4127. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Postmaster General to adjust certain claims of postmasters for loss by burglary, fire, or other unavoidable casualty," approved March 17, 1882, as amended.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR SENATOR THOMAS OF OKLAHOMA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary of the Senate has received the following telegram:

CHICAGO, ILL., December 3, 1945.

LESLIE BIFFLE,  
Secretary, United States Senate,  
United States Capitol:

Am in Chicago attending Cooperative Milk Convention. Please request Senator McKELLAR to have me excused for next 3 days.

ELMER THOMAS,  
United States Senator, Oklahoma.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none, and he is excused.

#### GREETING TO THE QUIZ KIDS

Mr. CONNALLY obtained the floor.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Idaho for a purpose which the Chair thinks the Senator from Texas will approve?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will always yield upon any suggestion from the Chair.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I have always prided myself that I endeavor to be a good sport at all times and love even my enemies and give them due credit. Last night the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANFILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and myself had a joust with the Quiz Kids, and they defeated us. Nevertheless, in the bigness of my heart, I want to call attention to the fact that the Quiz Kids are in the gallery at this moment, and I will ask them to rise so that we may see those who are smarter than at least one Senator.

(The Quiz Kids rose from their seats in the gallery.)